NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXLVIII.

MARCH, 1894.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BY THE HON. HILARY A. HERBERT, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

THE one factor in the American government that is subjected to more adverse criticism than all others combined is the House of Representatives. It is perhaps less honored in its own country than in any other, and this because the American public have never taken the trouble to understand its processes. Two foreigners, De Tocqueville, in his *Democracy in America*, and Professor Bryce, in his *American Commonwealth*, have treated of our House of Representatives and its methods with distinguished ability, and each has shown it quite as much favor as could have been expected. The ablest American work dealing philosophically with the subject is Prof. Woodrow Wilson's *Congressional Government*. The conclusions reached by the author seem to have been reasoned out in a spirit of fairness and impartiality, but they are very unsatisfactory to one who understands that the House, as we familiarly call it, must continue to be very much what it is now so long as our constitution of government remains as it is. It is limited by the law of its being, and nearly every serious objection urged against its methods by its critics grows out of organic causes.

It becomes, therefore, a matter of grave concern to inquire whether the criticisms of this body so generally indulged in are

Copyright, 1894, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well founded. Professor Wilson naturally compares it with its far-away prototype, the British House of Commons. He points out that the fundamental difference between the two is that the House of Commons is governed by a ministry, one compact body, and the American House by many committees; that from this it follows that under one system the rules are less complicated than under the other; that leadership in the one house is in one man, while it is divided in the other; that there is more of open debate in the English House of Commons and of interest in its proceedings than in the House of Representatives and its proceedings; and that the legislation of any one session is likely to be more harmonious and shapely as a whole in the former than in the latter: but it is not a necessary conclusion from these premises, as Professor Wilson would seem to think, that the English is the better legislative system; or that, because responsibility in our House is divided among a number of leaders, the party dominant there at the time is not sufficiently amenable to the people; or that the House of Representatives is not as responsive as it should be to public opinion; or that the laws it passes are not as fairly considered and as well adapted to their purposes as the English laws.

The practice that has contributed more than any other one cause to bring the House of Representatives into disrepute is filibustering, blocking the way of legislation by interposing dilatory motions, refusing to vote, and other parliamentary devices. There have been occasions when obstructive tactics were resorted to with advantage to the country, notably in the Forty-third Congress, when the minority was thus enabled to defeat the Force Bill. This feat was considered remarkable at the time, and tended greatly to commend the practice to the party that had profited by it, the Democracy. If appealed to only for the purpose of defeating a measure like the Force Bill, to the end that the country might pass directly upon it at the next election, or, if resorted to now and then, for a short time, to call attention to some peculiarly obnoxious measure, filibustering might be considered as having a legitimate place in parliamentary tactics, and would no doubt continue to exist; but the misfortune is that this weapon is within the reach of any member, and it has been so often used without discretion that the best sentiment of the country now condemns it in unmistakable terms.

In the Fifty-first Congress the Republicans, having control

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the House, to make up a quorum adopted the method of counting those who were present and refused to vote. As there was no precedent for this in the practices of the House, the Democrats naturally arrayed themselves against the new rule, and the contention over it was very bitter. The Supreme Court, however, has decided that the House, under the power to make its own rules, had the right to adopt this method, and it may therefore be safely affirmed that this rule or something like it will always obtain when the Republicans may be in control. This being so, it seems to follow that the Democratic party will be driven to the adoption of some similar rule, safe-guarded, perhaps, so as to prevent mistakes, which appeared to be unavoidable under the rule of the Fifty-second Congress. Either this must be done or some equally efficient method devised. No political party can afford to yield to its opponent permanently so great an advantage as the Republicans could claim if they, and they alone, could count their opponents to make up a quorum. That the Democrats are fully alive to the necessity of adopting methods that will enable them to despatch business is apparent, from the practice of the present House in bringing in hard-and-fast rules, limiting discussion, cutting off the right to amend and fixing the hour for votes. The large majority the dominant party has in the present House renders it possible for it now at the expense of considerable inconvenience, to proceed without counting the Republicans, who sometimes sit still and refuse to vote, but in future Congresses, whenever it becomes absolutely necessary, and the Democrats cannot count a quorum of their own, they will, it is believed, "count the quorum furnished by the voters."

The evils coming from obstructive tactics are not, however, peculiar to and do not grow out of our system of committee government. The British House of Commons has had its own obstructionists, and was at last, after many trying experiences, driven quite unwillingly to the adoption of rules that enable the majority to close debate and reach a vote. No political party with a majority in a legislative body can live if it allows its opponents to tie its hands, and this country need have no fear that, in the future, either of the two great parties will fail to do the business intrusted to it by the country according to the terms of its commission.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not possible to frame an excuse that would justify filibustering as it has been practised in latter years, but it is easy to show why it was so long tolerated. Twenty, and even ten years ago, the Democratic and Republican parties so profoundly distrusted each other that each was afraid to smooth for the other the pathway to easy legislation. The Republicans feared that some political revolution might "wipe away war legislation" including the tariff, and Democrats feared a more sweeping reconstruction law. It must be confessed also that there were Democrats, high in the councils of the party, who were not without their own anxieties lest, in some tidal wave, the high tariff might go. For these reasons "rights of minorities" were for many years sedulously cared for in the rules. More recently we have had to face the other question, "What are the rights of the majority?"

The reasons why the debates in the American House are not as fully reported and as keenly followed by the public as those of the House of Commons, and why the party in power in the House of Representatives has not and never can have any great leader who represents the government in every measure and upon whom all eyes are centred as they now are upon Gladstone or as they have been upon Disraeli or Charles James Fox or William Pitt, are fundamental. "The Government," as in England they call the Ministry, with the Prime Minister as chief, sits in the House of Commons; it matures and offers all important bills, and upon the success or failure of these it must stand or fall. Upon any signal defeat it goes out of power, and so every debate in the House of Commons is watched with somewhat of that lively interest with which, in America, we follow the progress of a presidential election. With us the defeat of a particular bill means simply the defeat of that measure. The consequences, whatever they may be to the party in power, are not immediate. The people have selected their officials for fixed terms. They have reserved to themselves the power, at the next elections, to vote upon the whole record made by a party, "confidence" or "want of confidence," and they are not watching to see what new "government" Congress is to give them. The Executive and Congress are, under our Constitution, so distinct and separate that there is nothing to bind them together in the maintenance of a common policy except allegiance to a common party. The power of these ties is, or ought to be, great, as there is not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much hope for the future success of a party if its legislators and its executive are at odds with each other; but this is all there is of it.

In the English House of Commons executive officers are present to answer questions, to explain their policies and to defend them. With us, as no executive officer can sit or vote or speak, either in the Senate or the House, the President must rely upon his party friends to defend his acts. From the nature of things he cannot have any one man, either in the House or the Senate, to defend him at all times and on all questions. Attacks upon the administration are made without warning. The constant effort is to surprise. If the assault is upon the dealings of the government with the Indians, as a rule, members of the Committee on Indian Affairs, who have the necessary information, come to his rescue; if on the management of the navy, the Naval Committee, or, on matters relating to the army, the Military Committee. must defend him. In England the Ministry sitting in the House of Commons, fully equipped to explain their policies, and having upon their shoulders the affirmative of every great issue, are represented by the Premier or some other of their number. Under such a system a great government leader on the floor of debate is not only possible, but he is a necessity; but with us such a leader cannot exist. No single member can be like an English minister, *caligatus omnia*. Presidents have generally had special friends on the floor of the House, and quite often some prominent member has been known as the mouthpiece of the Executive, speaking his sentiments, now and then, with more or less of authority; but a leader in the English sense, such a leader as our public prints and even our public men are often found deploring the need of, the parliamentary history of our country does not mention. Henry Clay was a great leader on the floor of the House, but he was not a government mouthpiece. Thad Stevens was a leader in the stirring times of the Civil War, and still more during the days of reconstruction, but he only stood for a leader on one idea at a time—on the prosecution of the war while it lasted, and on granting suffrage to the negro in the days of reconstruction. He was never known during the war as the special representative of the President, and in his reconstruction measures he boldly trampled under foot the policy that Mr. Lincoln

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had formulated and President Johnson was endeavoring to execute.

A minority leader, however, in the House of Representatives is possible within limits. It is not difficult to unite members who are animated by a common desire to turn a party out of power—and we need not go far to seek in our history for opposition leaders. Mr. Randall, although he was out of sympathy with the majority of his party on the great question of the tariff, was nevertheless, for a time, the acknowledged leader of the Democrats in opposition; and Mr. Reed was the undoubted leader of the Republicans from 1885 to 1889. But except the Speaker, Mr. Cleveland during his first administration had no friend on the floor upon whom he could look as leader of the House; and Mr. Harrison certainly was in no better plight.

Bills, before they are put upon their passage, especially those that deal with the great questions of taxation and appropriations, must be formulated after careful study and preparation. This work "the Government" does for the House of Commons, most of it during the recess of Parliament, and this body can therefore get itself down to the work of legislating almost immediately after it comes together. The House of Representatives must formulate its own bills, and this it can only do through committees. When Congress convenes and the House elects its speaker, he sets himself to the task of dividing it into fifty-six standing and select committees. This requires time. When committees are organized, they must perfect and report upon the bills or subjects referred to them, and this requires still more time. Government reports are to be read, witnesses examined, figures studied and compared, information to be acquired from the departments, and then the form and nature of the reports and bills are to be decided upon. As a rule to which there are few exceptions, the members of the great committees labor with unremitting zeal and fidelity. Duty impels them, and they know, too, the temper of the public. If, for example, a majority has been elected to increase subsidies, every subsidy-seeker knows just what he wants and he fails to see why Congress does not give it and go home. If on the other hand the majority chosen favors a reduction of taxation, one portion of the public is importunate for immediate relief, while the other is shouting through the press that Congress is depressing business by "tinkering with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tariff." Nobody understands this impatience better than a member of the House, who ordinarily has, in the necessity of looking after his own interests, business and political, at home, still another incentive to haste. There are several well-known instances of members breaking down, some of them dying outright from overwork, as did Haskell, of Kansas, Burnes, of Missouri, and probably Randall, of Pennsylvania; but the work of such men is done in the privacy of the committee-room, and while it is going on the public is usually clamoring about the delays in legislation.

Inasmuch as in England the Ministry prepares every important bill, the claim made by Englishmen may be true that the laws passed at any one session are more harmonious and consistent than they can be without any common supervision. In the earlier days of the republic, when the legislation of Congress was confined within narrow limits, our own laws had, in a great measure, such supervision. One committee, the Ways and Means, had jurisdiction over all questions of finance, taxation, and appropriation, but now no single committee could possibly perform all this work. The interests embraced in the legislation of Congress have multiplied even more rapidly than population, and the jurisdiction originally exercised by the Ways and Means Committee has been distributed among many other committees.

In England the majority represented by the Ministry ask no counsel of the minority in framing bills. The minority never see the bills until reported and ready for the action of the House of Commons. With us the minority is fairly represented on every committee. The speaker, partisan though he be, is expected to act with the utmost impartiality in apportioning the opposition to all the greater standing committees, and, as a matter of fact, having no friends among them to whom he is indebted for his seat, he is generally more just to the opposition in the make-up of committees than he is to his own party. One single case is remembered of a speaker who was said and believed to have told his friends that he had put the opposition where they could do the least possible harm. That speaker was a failure; this treatment of his political opponents was his first stumbling-block.

The speaker is the real party leader, upon whom, if they be of the same party, the executive must rely. The powers he may exercise to advance or retard legislation are in many respects au-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tocratic ; yet if he is to measure up to the full height of his great office he must not transcend the authority vested in him by the rules and the usages of the House. This his party does not expect or demand. In the Forty-ninth Congress the Republicans of the House presented to the Democratic speaker at the close of the session a silver service, in testimony of their appreciation of his fairness and ability, and yet no presiding officer was ever more acceptable to his party than Mr. Carlisle.

In our important committees not only all parties, but, as far as practicable, all sections of the Union are represented, and ample scope is given to debate. Does this system operate as a check on bad legislation ? Theory and doubtless all experienced members of the House would say that such is its tendency, although no one could be found to contend that any mere system can be relied on to always produce wise laws.

Professor Wilson, however, seems to think that this system is responsible for most of our vicious legislation. He mentions the "manufacturers who cultivate the favor of the Committee of Ways and Means, the interested persons who walk attendance on the Committee of Rivers and Harbors, and the mail contractors who court the Committee on Appropriations." If the charges he makes are well grounded, they go to the very foundations of our government, for it is not perceived how the House as an independent body can frame and perfect bills without the intervention of committees of some sort. Suppose the present system of many committees, working during the session, to be abandoned and one grand committee formed, having all the powers now exercised by the British Ministry, still such committee, whenever and wherever it might sit, would be subject to the solicitations of the lobby. Under any conceivable method interested persons may "cultivate the favor" of those who are framing bills. Subsidists pool their issues, get their jobs all, as far as practicable, into one bill, and force this through by their combined strengrh. This the people only can prevent. It would be useless for a committee of the House to report a high-tariff bill if the majority on the floor were unwilling to pass it, and it would be folly to enact it into law if it could not be sustained at the polls. As a rule tariff bills have been debated at greater length before the House, and discussed more fully before the people, than any other class of legislation. If high-tariff and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other subsidy laws be vicious, the responsibility for their enactment does not lie at the door of the committee system. The combinations now made to pass bills of this character would be made all the same whatever our system might be. Everybody knows that the people of the United States could not be induced to favor at the polls one industry, or even several, at the expense of others, and that those seeking class legislation must unite in their demand every possible interest. It matters not, therefore, when or where or by whom a tariff bill may be framed: there and then will be found every subsidy-seeker asking to be let into the combine, and if he can command votes at the polls he will be admitted, provided only that the party favoring subsidies be then in control. The remedy for evils such as these is to be sought at the hands of the people.

It is not intended in this article to assert that the committee system is perfect, but only to maintain that under our form of government the House of Representatives must necessarily have committees of its own members to prepare legislation, and that the system at present existing is not subject to the grave objections urged against it. It is true that members may trust committees too implicitly, but the same objection would seem to lie against a system of parliamentary government where the ministry must be followed implicitly in every important measure, the penalty of a defeat of the government, in every such case, being the immediate loss of every seat and another appeal to elections.

In one respect the House of Commons always appears to advantage when compared with the House of Representatives. The spectator, looking in upon the latter, sees a desk before each member, and unless upon occasions of extraordinary interest he finds perhaps a majority engaged in writing letters, reading newspapers, clapping for pages, etc., and he is quite likely to go away with the impression that Representatives generally do not know or care what is being done, whereas in the House of Commons there are no desks, no reading, or writing, or clapping for pages—only those are present who wish to listen. The advantage, however, is not so great as it appears to be. Under both systems members who have not heard the debate are on hand, when a division comes, to vote with their parties, and certainly those who have been brought by a "whip" into the House of Commons are no better prepared to vote intelligently than those who, in our House,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been sitting by, listening perhaps to the debate by snatches. The truth is not to be ignored that, whatever be the system and however large may be the legislative body, a few men will control the business. In the House of Commons one committee—the Ministry—controls everything. With us the several great committees control in turn.

The American practice of having desks and permitting members to read and write was defensible before Representatives voted themselves clerks, as they very properly did in the last Congress, as it was impossible for them to do their necessary correspondence without utilizing the hours of the session. Now it is hoped that in the near future desks will be removed, as nothing detracts so much from the respect the public ought to entertain for the House as the ragged appearance it ordinarily presents to the visitor.

The charge is also made that the House of Representatives is not sufficiently responsive to the demands of the people. The real grievance seems to be that individual members are too sensitive to what they imagine to be the demands of their immediate constituencies. They are generally too apprehensive that they may not please everybody, and rather than incur displeasure they abandon, now and then, the principles of the party which elevated them and rely upon their party friends at home to excuse the defection in that instance, because the lapse was in favor of some local interest. Here again the remedy is with the voters. The committee system is not at fault.

One undeniable advantage of our committee system is that it brings members of opposing parties and different sections into close personal relations with each other. The extent of population and territory, the variety of climate and products, with the geographical distribution of our industries result in a constant clash of interests. It certainly is desirable that those who are to reconcile these interests should be able to attribute to each other, where they exist, the virtues of patriotism and integrity, and every experienced member knows that mutual respect and confidence are a common, and warm friendship between men of opposing parties and from different sections a not uncommon, result of joint service on committees.

There has been a remarkable reaction from the estrangement and bitterness caused by the Civil War. The writer remembers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to have heard a Republican member from the far West, some years ago, express his astonishment that his Democratic friend from the South should say a kind thing about Abraham Lincoln on the floor of the House, and "let it stand that way in the *Record*." Another newly elected Republican member went up one day and introduced himself to a Southern Democrat with the remark that he was anxious to know the ex-Confederate "who was patriotic enough to vote an appropriation for continuing the monument to the Father of His Country." "Oh!" replied the Southerner, "I never go back on a slaveholder and a rebel like George Washington." The retort was not courteous, but the ex-Confederate was nettled at the imputation on the patriotism of his section.

The distrust of those days has passed away, and at this writing there is more of kindly and generous feeling and mutual confidence and less of ill-will between the members of the two great parties in Congress than at any other period within the last fifty years. This is attributable largely to joint service on committees. Such progress could not have been made if the two great parties had been constantly pitted against each other in debate only from opposite sides of the House under a parliamentary system like that prevailing in the British House of Commons. Quite a number of men on both sides of the aisle can now be pointed to who by long and continuous service have thoroughly established themselves in the confidence of the House. These men divide leadership in their respective parties among them. They are not all chairmen, or even first on the minority side of committees, though most of them are. When a chairman and his committee once get the confidence of the House, their bills, if they have no partisan edge to them, usually pass with little debate. The chairman who, in the familiar language of the House, means "business" and not "Buncombe" wisely commends himself to his fellow-members by not taking up the time of the House with unnecessary discussion. Thus it happens that the most useful and influential men are frequently not the most famous. There are many coustituencies in the United States who never have a chairman or a representative of influence in the House, for the reason that they are continually changing their members. They seem to utterly ignore the value of experience, which to a member of ability and character always gives knowledge and power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An incident occurring in the House near the close of the last session of the Fifty-second Congress furnishes a striking illustration, not only of the value of long service in that body and of the kindly feeling now existing there between parties, but also of the influence a broad-minded member can acquire, and the confidence with which his political opponents may come to regard him. It may also serve to show how it is that important bills often pass without much, and sometimes without any, debate. On February 4, 1893, Mr. Blount, of Georgia, who was about voluntarily to retire from the House after twenty years of continuous service, had just moved to report the Diplomatic Appropriation Bill from the Committee of the Whole, when Mr. Holman, Democrat, of Indiana, rose and complimented him on "having brought into the House a very important appropriation bill, which was so perfect in all its details as to receive the unanimous approval of this Committee of the Whole House." Among many other complimentary things Mr. Holman said:

"The House has become accustomed to pass bills reported by him without controversy. It must be gratifying to my distinguished friend to know that it is taken for granted that a bill reported by him has undergone the severest scrutiny in every detail, and that no consideration whatever has been taken into account except the interests of the public service."

At the conclusion of Mr. Holman's speech Mr. Hitt, the leading Republican upon the Foreign Affairs Committee, and who had served ten years in the House with Mr. Blount, arose and "heartily joining" with Mr. Holman "in every word he has said in testimony of the personal worth, of the high character, of the industry, of the energy, of the honorable gentleman from Georgia," added:

"I will mark most of all that patriotism above party that inspired him in the House when last year, leading a great committee charged to consider the affairs and interests, not of a party, but of a whole nation, embroiled in sharp dispute with a foreign power, he rose with the occasion and proved himself first and altogether a patriot, an American, so that a foreigner, looking down from the gallery upon this hall, could never have told whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, but would have known that he was in every fiber an American.

Mr. Hitt was alluding to the fact that Mr Blount had supported President Harrison's Chilian policy. He was followed by Mr. O'Neill, the oldest Republican in the House, and by other members in the same line, and every speaker was greeted by loud applause from all quarters of the House.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When President Cleveland desired to know the exact truth about the Hawaiian affair, he selected Mr. Blount as his special agent to Honolulu.

No portion of the government can claim exemption from the severest criticism, but so much ridicule has been levelled by the press at the *personnel* of the House of Representatives, and so many insinuations are constantly indulged in against the habits and integrity of its members, that every newly elected representative on coming into that body within recent years must have confessed to himself a feeling of profound surprise at what he has seen. He has heard much of corruption, but he sees no evidences of its existence. Possibly among so many there may be some who are corrupt, but the body, as a whole, may challenge comparison for integrity and fidelity with any in the world; he has heard of dissipation, but he finds that, with very few exceptions, the members are remarkable for sobriety and steady habits; and what surprises him most of all is the average ability and range of information possessed by those who surround him.

The career of many a member is a disappointment to himself and his friends. The surroundings are not what he and they expected. Accustomed at home to the homage of his friends, he thinks to be easily a leader in the House. He finds himself there surrounded by the most critical audience in the world. On whatever subject he would speak, some of his audience are more thoroughly informed than he, and it may be he never speaks at all. Of course it must be understood, all the time, that there are many exceptions to every general statement of this character, but a careful scrutiny of the *personnel* of the House, as it has existed for some years past, is sufficient proof that, as a rule, the people of a Congressional district do not send a Representative to Congress unless there be something about him, either ability, courage, high character, or other attractive quality, to commend him to their support. Taken altogether there can be no better guaranty of the capacity of the people of the United States for self-government than the character of the men they send to Washington to make their laws. The people who elect these men differ widely in their politics, but they are of one mind in intending, as they show by the selection of their Representatives, that this country shall be great and free and prosperous. And so it is to be.

HILARY A. HERBERT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW ASPECT OF THE WOMAN QUESTION.

BY SARAH GRAND, AUTHOR OF "THE HEAVENLY TWINS."

IT is amusing as well as interesting to note the pause which the new aspect of the woman question has given to the Bawling Brothers who have hitherto tried to howl down every attempt on the part of our sex to make the world a pleasanter place to live in. That woman should ape man and desire to change places with him was conceivable to him as he stood on the hearth-rug in his lord-and-master-monarch-of-all-I-survey attitude, well inflated with his own conceit; but that she should be content to develop the good material which she finds in herself and be only dissatisfied with the poor quality of that which is being offered to her in man, her mate, must appear to him to be a thing as monstrous as it is unaccountable. "If women don't want to be men, what do they want?" asked the Bawling Brotherhood when the first misgiving of the truth flashed upon them; and then, to reassure themselves, they pointed to a certain sort of woman in proof of the contention that we were all unsexing ourselves.

It would be as rational for us now to declare that men generally are Bawling Brothers or to adopt the hasty conclusion which makes all men out to be fiends on the one hand and all women fools on the other. We have our Shrieking Sisterhood, as the counterpart of the Bawling Brotherhood. The latter consists of two sorts of men. First of all is he who is satisfied with the cow-kind of woman as being most convenient; it is the threat of any strike among his domestic cattle for more consideration that irritates him into loud and angry protests. The other sort of Bawling Brother is he who is under the influence of the scum of our sex, who knows nothing better than women of that class in and out of society, preys upon them or ruins himself for them, takes his whole tone from them, and judges us all by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. Both the cow-woman and the scum-woman are well within range of the comprehension of the Bawling Brotherhood, but the new woman is a little above him, and he never even thought of looking up to where she has been sitting apart in silent contemplation all these years, thinking and thinking, until at last she solved the problem and proclaimed for herself what was wrong with Home-is-the-Woman's-Sphere, and prescribed the remedy.

What she perceived at the outset was the sudden and violent upheaval of the suffering sex in all parts of the world. Women were awaking from their long apathy, and, as they awoke, like healthy hungry children unable to articulate, they began to whimper for they knew not what. They might have been easily satisfied at that time had not society, like an ill-conditioned and ignorant nurse, instead of finding out what they lacked, shaken them and beaten them and stormed at them until what was once a little wail became convulsive shrieks and roused up the whole human household. Then man, disturbed by the uproar, came upstairs all anger and irritation, and, without waiting to learn what was the matter, added his own old theories to the din, but, finding they did not act rapidly, formed new ones, and made an intolerable nuisance of himself with his opinions and advice. He was in the state of one who cannot comprehend because he has no faculty to perceive the thing in question, and that is why he was so positive. The dimmest perception that you may be mistaken will save you from making an ass of yourself.

We must look upon man's mistakes, however, with some leniency, because we are not blameless in the matter ourselves. We have allowed him to arrange the whole social system and manage or mismanage it all these ages without ever seriously examining his work with a view to considering whether his abilities and his motives were sufficiently good to qualify him for the task. We have listened without a smile to his preachments, about our place in life and all we are good for, on the text that "there is no understanding a woman." We have endured most poignant misery for his sins, and screened him when we should have exposed him and had him punished. We have allowed him to exact all things of us, and have been content to accept the little he grudgingly gave us in return. We have meekly bowed our heads when he called us bad names instead of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demanding proofs of the superiority which alone would give him a right to do so. We have listened much edified to man's sermons on the subject of virtue, and have acquiesced uncomplainingly in the convenient arrangement by which this quality has come to be altogether practised for him by us vicariously. We have seen him set up Christ as an example for all men to follow, which argues his belief in the possibility of doing so, and have not only allowed his weakness and hypocrisy in the matter to pass without comment, but, until lately, have not even seen the humor of his pretensions when contrasted with his practices nor held him up to that wholesome ridicule which is a stimulating corrective. Man deprived us of all proper education, and then jeered at us because we had no knowledge. He narrowed our outlook on life so that our view of it should be all distorted, and then declared that our mistaken impression of it proved us to be senseless creatures. He cramped our minds so that there was no room for reason in them, and then made merry at our want of logic. Our divine intuition was not to be controlled by him, but he did his best to damage it by sneering at it as an inferior feminine method of arriving at conclusions; and finally, after having had his own way until he lost his head completely, he set himself up as a sort of a god and required us to worship him, and, to our eternal shame be it said, we did so. The truth has all along been in us, but we have cared more for man than for truth, and so the whole human race has suffered. We have failed of our effect by neglecting our duty here, and have deserved much of the obloquy that was cast upon us. All that is over now, however, and while on the one hand man has shrunk to his true proportions in our estimation, we, on the other, have been expanding to our own; and now we come confidently forward to maintain, not that this or that was "intended," but that there are in ourselves, in both sexes, possibilities hitherto suppressed or abused, which, when properly developed, will supply to either what is lacking in the other.

The man of the future will be better, while the woman will be stronger and wiser. To bring this about is the whole aim and object of the present struggle, and with the discovery of the means lies the solution of the Woman Question. Man, having no conception of himself as imperfect from the woman's point of view, will find this difficult to understand, but we know his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weakness, and will be patient with him, and help him with his lesson. It is the woman's place and pride and pleasure to teach the child, and man morally is in his infancy. There have been times when there was a doubt as to whether he was to be raised or woman was to be lowered, but we have turned that corner at last; and now woman holds out a strong hand to the child-man, and insists, but with infinite tenderness and pity, upon helping him up.

He must be taught consistency. There are ideals for him which it is to be presumed that he tacitly agrees to accept when he keeps up an expensive establishment to teach them: let him live up to them. Man's faculty for shirking his own responsibility has been carried to such an extent in the past that, rather than be blamed himself when it did not answer to accuse woman, he imputed the whole consequence of his own misery-making peculiarities to God.

But with all his assumption man does not make the most of himself. He has had every advantage of training to increase his insight, for instance, but yet we find him, even at this time of day, unable to perceive that woman has a certain amount of self-respect and practical good sense—enough at all events to enable her to use the proverb about the bird in the hand to her own advantage. She does not in the least intend to sacrifice the privileges she enjoys on the chance of obtaining others, especially of the kind which man seems to think she must aspire to as so much more desirable. Woman may be foolish, but her folly has never been greater than man's conceit, and the one is not more disastrous to the understanding than the other. When a man talks about knowing the world and having lived and that sort of thing, he means something objectionable; in seeing life he generally includes doing wrong; and it is in these respects he is apt to accuse us of wishing to ape him. Of old if a woman ventured to be at all unconventional, man was allowed to slander her with the imputation that she must be abandoned, and he really believed it because with him liberty meant license. He has never accused us of trying to emulate him in any noble, manly quality, because the cultivation of noble qualities has not hitherto been a favorite pursuit of his, not to the extent at least of entering into his calculations and making any perceptible impression on public opinion; and he never, therefore, thought

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of considering whether it might have attractions for us. The cultivation of noble qualities has been individual rather than general, and the person who practised it is held to be one apart, if not actually eccentric. Man acknowledges that the business of life carried on according to his methods corrodes, and the state of corrosion is a state of decay; and yet he is fatuous enough to imagine that our ambition must be to lie like him for our own benefit in every public capacity. Heaven help the child to perceive with what travail and sorrow we submit to the heavy obligation, when it is forced upon us by our sense of right, of showing him how things ought to be done.

We have been reproached by Ruskin for shutting ourselves up behind park palings and garden walls, regardless of the waste world that moans in misery without, and that has been too much our attitude; but the day of our acquiescence is over. There is that in ourselves which forces us out of our apathy; we have no choice in the matter. When we hear the "Help! help! help!" of the desolate and the oppressed, and still more when we see the awful dumb despair of those who have lost even the hope of help, we must respond. This is often inconvenient to man, especially when he has seized upon a defenceless victim whom he would have destroyed had we not come to the rescue; and so, because it is inconvenient to be exposed and thwarted, he snarls about the end of all true womanliness, cants on the subject of the Sphere, and threatens that if we do not sit still at home with cotton-wool in our ears so that we cannot be stirred into having our sympathies aroused by his victims when they shriek, and with shades over our eyes that we may not see him in his degradation, we shall be afflicted with short hair, coarse skins, unsymmetrical figures, loud voices, tastelessness in dress, and an unattractive appearance and character generally, and then he will not love us any more or marry us. And this is one of the most amusing of his threats, because he has said and proved on so many occasions that he cannot live without us whatever we are. O man! man! you are a very funny fellow now we know you! But take care. The standard of your pleasure and convenience has already ceased to be our conscience. On one point, however, you may reassure yourself. True womanliness is not in danger, and the sacred duties of wife and mother will be all the more honorably performed when women have a reasonable hope of be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coming wives and mothers of *men*. But there is the difficulty. The trouble is not because women are mannish, but because men grow ever more effeminate. Manliness is at a premium now because there is so little of it, and we are accused of aping men in order to conceal the side from which the contrast should evidently be drawn. Man in his manners becomes more and more wanting until we seem to be near the time when there will be nothing left of him but the old Adam, who said, "It wasn't me."

Of course it will be retorted that the past has been improved upon in our day; but that is not a fair comparison. We walk by the electric light: our ancestors had only oil-lamps. We can see what we are doing and where we are going, and should be as much better as we know how to be. But where are our men? Where is the chivalry, the truth, and affection, the earnest purpose, the plain living, high thinking, and noble self-sacrifice that make a man? We look in vain among the bulk of our writers even for appreciation of these qualities. With the younger men all that is usually cultivated is that flippant smartness which is synonymous with cheapness. There is such a want of wit amongst them, too, such a lack of variety, such monotony of threadbare subjects worked to death! Their "comic" papers subsist upon repetitions of those three venerable jests, the mother-in-law, somebody drunk, and an edifying deception successfully practised by an unfaithful husband or wife. As they have nothing true so they have nothing new to give us, nothing either to expand the heart or move us to happy mirth. Their ideas of beauty threaten always to be satisfied with the ballet dancer's legs, pretty things enough in their way, but not worth mentioning as an aid to the moral, intellectual, and physical strength that make a man. They are sadly deficient in imagination, too; that old fallacy to which they cling, that because an evil thing has always been, therefore it must always continue, is as much the result of want of imagination as of the man's trick of evading the responsibility of seeing right done in any matter that does not immediately affect his personal comfort. But there is one thing the younger men are specially good at, and that is giving their opinion; this they do to each other's admiration until they verily believe it to be worth something. Yet they do not even know where we are in the history of the world. One of them only lately, doubtless by way of ingratiating himself with the rest of the Bawling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brotherhood, actually proposed to reintroduce the Acts of the Apostles-of-the-Pavements; he was apparently quite unaware of the fact that the mothers of the English race are too strong to allow themselves to be insulted by the reimposition of another most shocking degradation upon their sex. Let him who is responsible for the economic position which forces women down be punished for the consequence. If any are unaware of cause and effect in that matter, let them read *The Struggle for Life* which the young master wrote in *Wreckage*. As the workingman says with Christ-like compassion: "They wouldn't be there, poor things, if they were not driven to it."

There are upwards of a hundred thousand women in London doomed to damnation by the written law of man if they dare to die, and to infamy for a livelihood if they must live; yet the man at the head of affairs wonders what it is that we with the power are protesting against in the name of our sex. But *is* there any wonder we women wail for the dearth of manliness when we find men from end to end of their rotten social system forever doing the most cowardly deed in their own code, striking at the defenceless woman, especially when she is down?

The Bawling Brotherhood have been seeing reflections of themselves lately which did not flatter them, but their conceit survives, and they cling confidently to the delusion that they are truly all that is admirable, and it is the mirror that is in fault. Mirrors may be either a distorting or a flattering medium, but women do not care to see life any longer in a glass darkly. Let there be light. We suffer in the first shock of it. We shriek in horror at what we discover when it is turned on that which was hidden away in dark corners; but the first principle of good housekeeping is to have no dark corners, and as we recover ourselves we go to work with a will to sweep them out. It is for us to set the human household in order, to see to it that all is clean and sweet and comfortable for the men who are fit to help us to make home in it. We are bound to raise the dust while we are at work, but only those who are in it will suffer any inconvenience from it, and the self-sufficing and self-supporting are not afraid. For the rest it will be all benefits. The Woman Question is the Marriage Question, as shall be shown hereafter.

SARAH GRAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PRESENT CHANCE FOR AMERICAN SHIPPING.

BY THE HON. EUGENE TYLER CHAMBERLAIN, COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION.

THE entire range of federal affairs offers no other more promising field for reconstructive legislation at the present time than that afforded by the navigation laws of the United States. That they are old and out of date and out of joint with American progress and performance since the time of their enactment is indicated by their failure to produce the results for which presumably they were framed and by discontent with them, shared by ultra-protectionists and extreme free traders alike. The advocates of free shipping, indeed, bring no stronger indictment against the navigation laws of the country than that brought by those who confess, in effect, the insufficiency of those laws, after a trial lasting almost throughout the nation's lifetime, by asking that they be supplemented by bounties and subsidies paid from the Treasury. Protectionism has been carried to its utmost statutory limit by the absolute prohibition of the purchase of vessels in any but the home market, and surely no more insidious attack upon its inadequacy to produce results could be made than in the assertion of protectionists that a bonus directly from the Treasury is still a necessary incentive to bring purchasers into that exclusive market.

Where discontent with statutes is manifestly so general as to include those who stand at the opposite extremes of an economic theory, as in the matter of the navigation laws, discussion of the theory ties the hands of those who have an earnest desire to accomplish something positive to relieve a condition of affairs far from creditable to the United States. Is there more than an academic value to debates in which the free-ship theory is opposed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the subsidy theory, when those debates do not hoist the American flag over a single additional vessel and do not give the country the fraction of a per cent. more of a diminishing share in the world's carrying trade? Treasury conditions forbid the consideration of subsidies as a practical measure now and for some years to come; and existing political conditions, as well as the failure of Congress, during many years of alternating party domination, to pass a free-ship bill, are not encouraging to the supporters of such a measure at present, however desirable it be in principle.

If anything is to be done to encourage American shipping, men of widely different views, united, however, on the one point of the insufficiency of existing law, must be willing, at least for the time being, to hold in abeyance their preconceived notions of what *ought* to be done, and look toward what *can* be done. If there be any practical method in legislation by which more American vessels can be built and the American flag can be hoisted over more vessels engaged in the ocean carrying trade, to obtain those desirable results practical men may well afford to waive extreme views and unite upon middle ground, especially if there prove to be a precedent, which is reliably prophetic of benefit to all interests directly involved and to the general welfare.

The present is peculiarly a favorable time for the consideration of such a measure, if one can be found. The friends and opponents of the Wilson tariff bill agree that it will increase our international exchanges; and that increase surely may be taken as a propitious opportunity for the effort to obtain a larger share of the business and profit of ocean transportation. Again, our navy is now more widely scattered over the globe and our national emblem a more familiar sight in foreign ports than for many years. The encouragement which the flag, according to the familiar adage, affords to commerce, for the first time in a third of a century now exists. Still further, a measure of which it may be safely predicted that, in some degree at least, it will afford more employment for labor and capital, appeals with especial force to the American people under existing industrial conditions.

Such a measure fortunately lies close on the surface of recent statutes, needing no change in principle to bring about desirable results, and only such changes in detail as will give it general application, instead of application restricted virtually to one cor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poration. The act of May 10, 1892, in effect admitted to American registry the two Atlantic liners, "Paris" and "New York," on condition that complete American ownership should be established, and that the American purchasers of those vessels should contract to build in American shipyards a tonnage equivalent to the tonnage of those two vessels, no American-built steamship so constructed to be of less than 7,000 tons burthen. The act also provided that vessels registered under it could be acquired by the government at a fair valuation, if needed as cruisers or transports in time of war. Other conditions were laid down in the act, but their sole effect, if not purpose, was to define two splendid steamships as specifically as if they had been called by name and to give the International Navigation Company a special privilege. This act passed the House of Representatives without division and passed the Senate on a unanimous report by the Committee on Commerce, presented by the Hon. William P. Frye, with few dissenting votes, and that dissent in the main appears from the *Record* to have been based upon objections to the bestowal of a special privilege rather than to the theory of compensating American shipyards with an equivalent in work for American purchases of foreign steamships.

The privilege bestowed by the act of May 10, 1892, has been wisely and beneficially used; so well used, in fact, as to suggest that if American shipowners and shipbuilders generally were permitted to avail themselves of the privilege it bestowed upon one corporation, our merchant marine would soon be augmented by the purchase and registry of desirable foreign-built vessels, while at the same time construction in our own shipyards would be stimulated.

What would be the probable immediate effects of an act of Congress in brief terms permitting any American citizen to purchase abroad, free of duty, a vessel of any description and of recent construction, and to obtain for it an American register, on the simple condition that before the issue of such register he shall give a bond to the United States, under suitable Treasury regulations, to build in American shipyards a vessel or vessels of equivalent tonnage and value? The answer to this question need not be speculative, for in a restricted field the question was put an the answer rendered by the act of 1892. That act has added two steamships, which have not half a dozen superiors afloat, to the American merchant marine, and the admission of the British-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

built "New York" to American registry was made the occasion for jubilation on Washington's Birthday last year, to share in which President Harrison journeyed from Washington to New York. So far from diminishing the opportunities and rewards of American labor, that act has put on the stocks in the yards of Messrs. Cramp & Sons, of Philadelphia, two steamships, all of American design and material, to be launched this year, of which the American public, judging from the splendid work of construction done by the same firm for the American Navy, is warranted in having high hopes. And under the same act the purchase of more foreign steamships by the same corporation, and the construction of an equivalent tonnage in the American yards of the firm named, are contemplated or in progress.

But every American shipowner cannot command the capital to purchase vessels of 8,000 tons or upwards, capable of a continuous speed of twenty knots an hour across the Atlantic, nor has every American shipbuilder the facilities to construct a like class of vessels. The bulk of the carrying trade of the Atlantic and Pacific is not carried on in ocean greyhounds and doubtless never will be. If the principle, so successfully invoked in the case of the "New York" and the "Paris," is to be of general service to American shipowners and shipbuilders, it must not be restricted by conditions as to tonnage and speed which enable only those with the great capital commanded by the International Navigation Company and the Cramps to make use of it. Possibly as a tentative measure the act of 1892 was properly restricted; and certainly the corporation which secured the passage of the measure, and the shipbuilding firm which has developed it into a source of profitable employment for labor and capital, deserve credit. They have demonstrated that a more liberal policy toward shipping than that which was adopted in the early years of the republic as the price for the continued maintenance of the institution of slavery does not mean the closing of American shipyards. The experiment has now been made successfully. It has been shown that the admission of foreign-built vessels to American registry is possible with a simultaneous increase in American construction, and may even contribute to it. To stop with the act of 1892 without carrying it to its logical conclusion by giving it general application and enabling all to share in its benefits, is avowedly to stop short at the grant of a special privilege, to put

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aside an opportunity to increase the tonnage of the American merchant-marine and the construction of vessels in American shipyards.

But the act of 1892 is not the only ground on which the admission to American registry of foreign-built vessels, under conditions, if necessary, is manifestly desirable. There is a curious anomaly in the navigation laws of the United States as they stand. If a foreign vessel be wrecked in American waters, and this wreck be repaired at three times its cost as a wreck by American purchasers, it is then entitled to American registry. The eagerness and persistence with which American shipowners and shipbuilders seek to avail themselves of this peculiar provision of the law throw a powerful sidelight on the use which would be made of such a general act as that suggested. Should a staunch vessel of the most recent and approved construction, built abroad, though owned by Americans, be forbidden to fly the American flag, even if its American owners be willing to expend the entire amount of its value as a new and sound vessel or more, in domestic construction? To the American shipowner the new vessel must be of greater value than the repaired wreck, and to the American shipbuilder original construction must be more profitable and more creditable than repair work; yet no possible chance to make use of this old law is neglected. The opportunities afforded by the proposed act, it is safe to predict, would be welcomed.

And if use is made of them, a simple act as outlined must contribute much to a final solution of the shipping question, so called, by giving American shipowners and shipbuilders precise *data* as to the relative first cost of home-built and foreign-built vessels, their relative efficiency, durability, cost of operation, and other factors which make up profit and loss in the carrying trade.

It must stimulate inventive ingenuity by putting side by side with American vessels under one ownership the newest and presumably the best vessels of foreign build of various classes and descriptions.

It must increase the opportunities for the employment of American labor on land and sea.

It must increase the activity of American shipyards by giving them the work of repairs on an increased tonnage of registered American shipping.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It must aid in the development of the industries in steel and iron and other materials, contributory to shipbuilding, now in progress under the stimulus of the rehabilitation of the American navy.

It must increase the share of the United States in the carrying trade of the world.

Finally, these results will be obtained without the objectionable application of public funds to the promotion of private enterprise, without the violation of any canon of equitable taxation, but solely through the methods employed every day by the business man who offsets a high-priced purchase of securities or land or goods with a lower priced purchase in the same lines, and finds his profit by striking an average of his purchases.

Doubtless the time is not many years distant when we shall build ships of iron or steel better and more cheaply than they can be built anywhere in the world, as our native forests enabled us to surpass all in the days of wooden vessels. The navigation laws of the United States will not hasten the dawn of that day, nor can they effectively retard it. But they can and do operate to deprive this generation of opportunities for national development, which the Fifty-second Congress saw and made limited use of when it admitted the "New York" and the "Paris" to American registry.

EUGENE TYLER CHAMBERLAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OUTLOOK FOR WAR IN EUROPE.

BY ARCHIBALD FORBES.

THE editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has paid me the compliment of desiring that I should place at the disposition of his readers my views and impressions in regard to this subject. It is a subject so full of intricacy and many-sidedness as to enforce on a serious writer a deep sense of diffidence in venturing to deal with it. Indeed, I should decline the requisition which has been made upon me were it not for one thing: for the recollection that I have studied the respective military characters of most of the nations of continental Europe under the truest test—that of the actual battlefield; and for another thing: that during the subsequent years of peace I have taken great pains to keep abreast of the colossal expansion and development in the armaments of the European nations. This species of personal equipment is, I am sensible, not strictly germane in the discussion of the specific theme allotted to me. It may constitute me something of a minor authority regarding the relative fighting merits of the nations when engaged in actual warfare, and the probable outcome of a gigantic European struggle if that should occur. If and when a great European war is clearly and inevitably imminent, the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW may honor me by desiring to have my impressions on the points referred to. What it calls for now is a contribution towards the problem, whether the present "bloated armaments" and prolonged military tension must inevitably result in a great war, and if that be assumed, when, according to the signs and tokens, and having regard to the strain of oppressive military preparation and the yet more oppressive strain of military preparedness, the outbreak of the tremendous conflict may be looked for.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Regarded superficially, looked at from the point of view of "the man in the street," it would seem that there is really no problem at all. The light-hearted outsider, and the continental citizen who writhes under the burden of taxation for military purposes, agree in the conviction that early war is inevitable. But, on the other hand, the responsible heads of affairs have to realize the certainty that, burdensome as is the existing armed peace, the resort to war would, in the nature of things, be infinitely more costly. Nor could any approximate estimate of that enhanced expense be made in advance, because of the indefiniteness of the war's duration. Yet the charges of a war might be endured—indeed, might be welcomed—if the war were the means to an end: that end being, when peace time should recur, a great and reasonably permanent reduction in military expenditure. But this is extremely improbable. Modern wars have the pestilential result of being invariably followed by greatly increased armaments. Thus the future is gloomier even than the present, and the national authorities may "rather bear the ills they have than fly to others that they know not of."

In his old age, Moltke wrote:

"Generally speaking, it is no longer the ambition of monarchs which endangers peace; but the impulses of a nation, its dissatisfaction with its internal conditions, the strife of parties and the intrigues of their leaders. The great wars of recent times have been declared against the wish and will of the reigning powers. To-day the question is not so much whether a nation is strong enough to make war, as whether its government is powerful enough to prevent war."

He had forgotten the Austro-Prussian war of 1866, made by Wilhelm and Bismarck right in the teeth of the Prussian nation's unmistakable manifestations of dislike. But he was right in regard to France in 1870, when the frantically excited nation whirled into war the reluctant Napoleon. And again he was strangely right regarding Russia in the winter of 1876–77, when Alexander II., absolute despot though he was, had his hand forced by the Pan-Slavist majority of a normally voiceless nation. But Moltke's dictum does not hold as concerns the present. Of the five principal nations of the continent which to-day stand armed to the teeth under the baleful shadow of obstinate militarism, there is but one that proclaims a burning ardor for war. This France has never ceased doing for more than twenty years. She cherished and professed a bitter rancor against England for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

twice as long as that, and nothing came of it. But England had cut no provinces out of France's vitals; and France's purpose of revenge against Germany is to-day more intense than it was when the crape still covered the face of the statue of Strasbourg in the Place de la Concorde. The Russian squadron which recently visited Toulon, and whose officers were fêted so lavishly at Paris, displayed an enthusiasm tempered with reserve on one important particular, an enthusiasm which unquestionably had a certain significance so far as it went. But the Russian people are destitute of any channel of expressing themselves as a nation, and the sporadic ebullitions of nihilism through the medium of dynamite do not entice to an investigation as to any popular opinion that may exist; the outcome of the unique burst of Pan-Slavic fervor in 1876–77 was not of a character to stimulate a recrudescence of zeal in favor of a new crusade. So much for the national feeling in each of the two populations which now constitute what has now come to be called the "Dual Alliance."

Of the peoples which make up the "Triple Alliance," Germany as a nation evinces no ardent fervor for war, and she is grumbling louder and louder as the incubus of taxation waxes heavier. But the Teutons, nevertheless, have fine soldierly instincts, and when their Emperor gives the word, they will wheel into line with all the grand old discipline and promptitude. Austria-Hungary is a fascine of states and nationalities destitute of internal cohesion, and loosely bound together mainly by the universal popularity of the Emperor Francis Joseph. To use the metaphor of a well-known writer: "The sole centre of attraction which, powerless to fuse and unite, is content to keep the various peoples of the Austrian Empire in juxtaposition, is the dynasty working through the parliament." Its diversified races are mainly engrossed in somewhat disquieting internal questions, and disclose no evidences of an eagerness for war. But they are all of a lively soldierly temperament, and although they have almost invariably been curiously unfortunate in war, there are no finer troops than those which march under the banner of the Dual Monarchy. Italy is the weak vessel of the Triple Alliance. She has lived too fast during her short life of thirty-three years, and is now mournfully undergoing the sombre results of having freely burned the candle at both ends. Her membership of the Triple Alliance has cost her much more than she could rightly afford.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and unless she is subsidized by an opportune loan, she cannot but be within measurable distance of virtual bankruptcy. Impecuniosity so severe as to result in bankruptcy deteriorates a nation internally and externally, but bankruptcy has never hindered a nation from engaging in war to preserve its existence. At the beginning of the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, Turkey was in the deepest abyss of national bankruptcy, yet she held her own for six months in the field, and it was not financial exhaustion, but Skobeleff and Gourko, that brought about her collapse. Italy staggers under the burden of a national debt amounting to $2,550,000,000, and she has a floating debt of about $130,000,000 more; her revenue for the current year will not exceed $310,000,000, of which interest on the indebtedness absorbs one-half. The balance is quite inadequate to defray the national charges, and the naval and military efficiency of Italy is undergoing impairment. But in the frank language of Satan, in the book of Job: "Skin for skin; yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life"; and it is the same with a nation. Default in meeting the interest on her debt would furnish Italy with the wherewithal to meet her enemy in the gale—to become a powerful and efficient member of the Triple Alliance when the time should come for the great continental issues to be fought out. There is an impression which seems to have some foundation that some time ago Italy was swerving from her fidelity to the Triple Alliance. But if so, she was brought up with a round turn by Germany, and her present government is in firm adherence to the Alliance and in thorough accord with England as to Mediterranean questions.

Obscure and ominous as is the present situation in Europe, it has one redeeming characteristic—a comparative immunity from isolated surprises. On July 5, 1870, a British statesman, who certainly had claims to be well informed, affirmed publicly that the political horizon of Europe was without a cloud; on the 19th of July the French *chargé d'affaires* in Berlin delivered to Bismarck France's formal declaration of war against Prussia. The Europe of to-day need not live in apprehension of any such sudden and startling rupture of her existent and sombre quietude. No one of the five great powers has an independent individual freedom of action. Indeed, it may be said, in a sense, that there are no longer five, but only two great powers—the Dual Alliance, consisting of France and Russia, and the Triple Alliance, consisting of Ger-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many, Austria, and Italy. It follows that, instead of there being five possibilities of sudden war, there are only two—an offensive initiative taken by the Dual Alliance, or the same action taken by the Triple Alliance. I limit myself by designating these two latter possibilities simply as abstract possibilities, because I know of no means of actually ascertaining whether the respective alliances contemplate hostile action, or prefer to maintain indefinitely the arduous attitude of armed peace. But I believe myself justified in definitely specifying the length of time that must elapse before the stupendous conflict can begin, regarding the question from a reasonable military point of view.

Basing myself, then, on that view, I have the confident anticipation that the present year will elapse without echoing to the clash of arms; and I consider it very probable that 1895 will also pass without bloodshed between the two alliances. The after-future is inscrutable. The facts on which I found are condensed below.

1. THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE.—Germany, its leading power, although for the last ten years the empire has been borrowing for "extraordinary purposes" about $42,500,000 annually with the resultant increment of taxation, is, as she has been for many years, ready for war to the minutest item and on the shortest notice. She is stronger to-day than ever before, by the added 70,000 men which the Army Act of last October sanctioned. Her army of twenty army corps consists now of 538 battalions and 173 half-battalions of infantry—the latter recently established for the training of reserve-formations and as depots in war time—465 squadrons of cavalry, and 494 batteries of artillery. A third division will be assigned to each army corps in war time, and the corps on the French and Russian frontiers are exceptionally strengthened in artillery and infantry. Germany is now superior to France in field artillery. By the reduction of color-service to two years, she will henceforth annually pass into the reserve half as many men again as were passed under the three-years service. Full ready in men and arms, she possesses in the Kriegs-Schatz, or war-treasure, a great hoard of money accumulated solely for meeting the earliest charges of a campaign. It was stout old Friedrich Wilhelm, father of Frederick the Great, who began this accumulation—"depositing the silver in barrels in the cellars of his schloss," and moulding more of it into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"chandeliers, mirror-frames, balustrades, and music-balconies." Before Fritz had ended the seven-years war, barrelled bullion and balustrades had gone into the melting-pot. But in time the Kriegs-Schatz was re-established; and I have heard that when the French milliards came in after 1870, the war-hoard amounted to $100,000,000. Strong as Germany is to-day—I have been writing mainly of her peace strength—she will continue steadily to increase in strength in the future, because of her constantly swelling population, now amounting to 49 millions. Meantime, while she whets her sword assiduously, she follows after the manner of the patriarch Asher by abiding in her breaches; and this the more wisely because, although the fact is often overlooked, the Austro-German treaty is simply defensive, or, properly speaking, rather non-aggressive, as against Russia. The attitude of Austria is in a general sense identical with that of Germany. The former, however, is less fully equipped for war; her army, I believe, is not yet supplied in its entirety with the magazine rifle. But Austria's principal weakness is, and always has been, in the lack of capacity in the higher commands—a defect which will continue while her armies and corps are commanded by archdukes and courtiers. Owing to the abuse of the practice of granting, for the sake of economy, "unlimited leave" to a great proportion of the troops of the "permanent army," and to the disproportionate numerical superiority of the two militias over the line troops, the army of Italy cannot be described as being in the highest condition of efficiency.

2. THE DUAL ALLIANCE.—To-day France is at the very apex of her military strength and preparedness. She had her fortunate escape from virtual destruction in 1875, when she so strenuously rushed the increase of her armaments that Moltke always held it a political crime that he was not then allowed to go in upon her and crush her outright. Thanks to the devoted patriotism and wonderful resources of the nation, the army of France has grown in strength and efficiency by leaps and bounds, until in 1889 the system of universal service was actually pushed to its logical conclusion, and since then, with a minimum of exemption, every man fit for service and of proper age has been taken into training. Although rendered by this rigorous measure actually stronger than Germany, France in her isolation has refrained from trying issues with a state possessed of allies; and she remained biting the file

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until her recent *rapprochement* with Russia. Whether there now exists between the great empire and the great republic, between the extremes of absolutism and of democracy, a firm and specific alliance, offensive and defensive, or whether the relation is merely something between an understanding and a pledge, is not revealed unto us. Of the Tsar's recent visitors to France, amidst the gushing reciprocation of affection the watchword was always "Peace! Peace!" whereat the Frenchman blandly smiled and murmured *sotto voce*, "Hey for the recapture of Alsace!" I do not think it is too much to say of France that, whether because of satisfactory assurances or cherishing the wish that is father to the thought, ever since the Toulon effusiveness she is content to subordinate her own initiative and to watch with all eyes for any signals that may come across the continent from St. Petersburg. She may well pray that if these are to come at all, they may not be long delayed. It is true that she may be rich enough to support the prolonged strain of rigorous universal service. But in contrast with the elasticity of Germany, resulting from a larger and more prolific population, France can add nothing to her present military strength, because of the non-increase, and indeed threatened decrease, of her population.

Russia is the bogey of Europe. The annual spring scare, which for the last five years the newspapers and the busybodies have punctually tried to galvanize, uniformly concerns itself with Russian designs of imminent aggressiveness. A twelvemonth ago, I remember, a clever American gentleman, Mr. Poultney Bigelow, devoted himself in a London weekly newspaper to the effort of fluttering the bourses and messrooms of the Continent, by adducing a multiplicity of data which he held to be convincing evidence that, to quote his own words: "Russia is on the eve of enterprises which, if successful, will give to Europe, not merely one, but a dozen Polands." Mr. Bigelow had picked up a good deal of information about Russian military movements, but he did not quite understand that, in the sapient phrase of Captain Cuttle, "The bearings of an observation lays in the application on it." It is perfectly true that of Russia's twenty army corps plus three independent infantry divisions, four independent cavalry divisions, and thirteen rifle brigades, there are to-day in Russia literally no troops of the active regular army, apart from the local army corps of the Caucasus, east of a line roughly drawn from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Archangel in the north to Taganrog in the south. The concentration of Russian troops toward the western frontier Mr. Bigelow averred to have been in progress with more or less energy ever since the Triple Alliance was called into being. That alliance was definitely formed in the spring of 1883. But, as a matter of fact, this westward trend of the Russian army had begun long before that date. Its inception was the outcome, and the legitimate outcome, of Sadowa and of Prussia's sudden advance into the first rank of military powers in the startling campaign of 1866. In the movement there was no shadow or suggestion of menace, at all events up to the dissolution of the *Drei Kaiser-Bund* in 1878, although later, it is true, events might have seemed to impart to it something of that complexion. But Russia was certainly within her clear right—nay, it was her clear duty to herself—to enter upon and persevere with the movement of her forces toward her western frontier, which is her strategic frontier, and on which, therefore, lies her chief vulnerability. The movement has no doubt progressed in recent years with greater vigor than previously. Unquestionable as are the potential military advantages of the western concentration, its drawbacks are extremely serious. Were each division to remain on its own recruiting-ground, the process of mobilization—of calling out its reserves to raise it from the peace strength to the war strength—would be easy. But then the delay would present itself involved in moving the mobilized force toward the frontier over long distances by sparse railroads, unequipped with a sufficiency of rolling stock and of expert hands to work the lines up to their full power. So a compromise is had recourse to. The expense is incurred of maintaining the field army in its westward positions, not in its economical peace strength, but midway between that and the full war strength. For example, the peace strength of a battalion, exclusive of officers, is 400 men, its war strength 1,000; the "increased peace strength" at which is maintained the bulk of the battalions of the field army, is 600 men per battalion, or six-tenths of the war strength. But on the outbreak of war, mobilization—*i. e.*, the work of bringing the army up to its war strength—involves the delay in bringing up to the front the reserves from their homes in the distant interior. During this mobilization period, which is computed to last for two and one-half months, the Russian army on the Polish frontier would no doubt confine itself

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the defensive, and while awaiting its reserves would probably harbor in the great pentagon formed by the fortresses of Warsaw, Novo-Georgiewsk, Brest-Litowski, Bialystok, and Ivanograd. Formal declarations of war are now out of fashion, and the commencement of mobilization on Russia's part, ascertained by alert spies, would doubtless be regarded by Germany and Austria as full justification for utilizing their condition of comparative readiness to take the offensive.

Russia makes ends meet, at all events on paper. She expends large sums in the construction of harbors and railroads, mostly for strategic rather than industrial purposes. Her foreign indebtedness is diminishing by the automatic action of the faithfully maintained sinking-funds. Her Finance Minister has just announced that the treasury has funds to meet "any considerable disbursement during the year, and that there is not the slightest necessity for incurring any fresh loan." It is a significant fact that she has accumulated a fund of twenty million dollars in gold to meet the disbursements of her army operating on foreign soil, where her paper currency would not find acceptation. The armed strength of Russia has attained unprecedented proportions. It would not be a Russian army if it were not a good deal stronger on paper than in the field. Since the Armageddon on the plains of Leipsic in 1814 Russian troops have encountered only Turks and barbarians. They have been by no means uniformly successful against the latter, and the former once and again sent the Russian masses staggering backward in the campaign of 1877–78. Than the Russian soldier there is no braver or clumsier man. Napoleon said of him that it was not enough to kill him—you had to knock him down afterwards. The regimental officers are recklessly brave, perfectly frivolous, amusingly ignorant of their profession, and dissatisfied with life without alcohol, preferably in the form of champagne. The superior commanders, except in the Guards, are for the most part neither able, zealous, nor methodical. Skobeleff in his untimely grave, and Gourko on his death-bed, one searches in vain for military genius, save in the rugged and truculent Kuropatkin, now, I believe, Chief of the General Staff. From the commander-in-chief to the corporal the Russian Army is unspeakably corrupt; the offence of fraud and dishonesty is as rank and ripe to-day as when seventeen years ago the Grand Duke Nicholas, his knavish old

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chief-of-staff, and the Greger-Horowitch Commissariat Contracting Company formed a cheerful ring and plundered their millions.

The situation is strange, lurid, and in a sense humiliating. Armed Europe waits upon the ultimate mandate of one man. "The heaven for height," says Solomon, "the earth for depth, and the heart of kings is unsearchable." Tsar Alexander III. has two ruling emotions—a horror of war, and a hatred of Germany. The problem is, Which passion in him shall conquer the other? Trammelled by no parliament, influenced neither by responsible ministers nor by personal favorites, the big, lonely despot is wrestling out that problem single-handed. It is an awful position. There is no real public opinion in Russia whose voice might sway the autocrat; he must fight out his own battle with himself. Probably no solution would better please him individually than a general disarmament, but that is hopeless. We must leave him to his wrestlings with himself; meanwhile, at all events, there is a period of reasonably assured respite. Russia is never quite ready, and the millennium will probably surprise her in her chronic attitude of unreadiness. At present she is swapping, not horses, but rifles. A year ago there was not a magazine rifle in the Russian army, and the great majority of her soldiers are still armed with the improved "Berdan," a very inferior weapon both to the German and the Austrian rifle. But Russia retains still the warning memory of her fearful losses before Plevna from the "Remingtons" which America placed in the hands of the Turks, and with which her obsolete "Krenkes" could not cope. After much tedious experimenting, a year ago a definite selection was made of a weapon known as the "three-line rifle," and the production and issue of this firearm are being pushed forward with great energy. But you cannot order in two and a half million rifles as you can a bundle of toothpicks. I believe that about a third of the requisite quantity is now delivered. It is absolutely impossible that the equipment can be completed and the troops trained to the use of the new weapon within the present year; it seems extremely improbable that this result can be attained before the spring of 1896. The opportunity for war—I do not say the certainty of war—will come when Russia shall have completed the equipment of her hosts with the "three-line" rifle.

Finally, one thing is certain: if the conflict comes, it will be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a struggle to the death. The *vae victis* will be overwhelming, for the nations which shall be vanquished must reckon on suffering dismemberment. The map of Europe will be transformed out of recognition. If the Triple Alliance conquers, there will be no longer a French nation, and Russia will be reft of all territory west of the Dnieper, and of the Baltic Provinces as well. In the contrary result, Italy will be the washpot of France, and over Germany will Russia cast her shoe.

ARCHD. FORBES.

N. B.—The following statistics, which I have carefully compiled from the most recent and trustworthy authorities, can be relied on as approximately accurate, and may be found of service by the readers of the foregoing article:

		Officers and men.	Horses.	Guns.
DUAL ALLIANCE. Peace strength.	Russia	1,033,661	150,000	2,200
	France	538,738	122,000	2,810
Total		1,572,399	272,000	5,010
TRIPLE ALLIANCE. Peace strength.	Germany	593,550	120,000	2,964
	Austria	319,235	65,500	1,000
	Italy	238,000	52,000	860
Total		1,150,785	237,500	4,824
DUAL ALLIANCE. War strength.	Russia	2,411,105	463,000	5,200
	France	2,715,600	800,000	4,500
Total		5,126,705	1,263,000	9,700
TRIPLE ALLIANCE. War strength.	Germany	2,440,000	562,150	4,430
	Austria	1,590,000	292,000	2,140
	Italy	1,253,200	134,000	1,620
Total		5,287,200	988,150	8,190
DUAL ALLIANCE. Total peace strength		1,572,399	272,000	5,010
TRIPLE ALLIANCE. Total peace strength		1,150,785	237,500	4,824
In favor of Dual Alliance, peace strength		421,614	34,500	186
DUAL ALLIANCE. Total war strength		5,126,705	1,263,000	9,700
TRIPLE ALLIANCE. Total war strength		5,287,200	988,150	8,190
		160,495	274,850	1,510
War strength Triple Alliance infantry superior to Dual by 160,495 men. Number of horses inferior to Dual by 274,850; guns ditto by 1,510.				
Total forces available by both alliances in war, field troops only		10,413,905	2,241,150	17,890
Gross population of both alliances, 272,569,462.				

A. F.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATURAL MONOPOLIES AND THE WORKINGMAN.

A PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL REFORM.

BY RICHARD T. ELY, DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE AND HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

THERE are various undertakings which are monopolies by virtue of their own inherent properties. Recent discussions have made these businesses well known. They are railways, telegraphs, telephones, canals, irrigation works, harbors, gasworks, street-car lines, and the like. Experience and deductive argument alike show that in businesses of this kind there can be no competition, and that all appearances which resemble competition are simply temporary and illusory.

It will be observed that these undertakings are nearly all of them comparatively new. They are an industrial field which has recently been opened. They are a non-competitive class of industries super-imposed upon the world of competitive industries, viz., agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. They have nearly all come into existence in the present century, and their growth has been so marvellous that they now represent a large proportion of all the wealth of the civilized world. It has even been claimed that railways alone in the United States comprise one-fifth of the entire wealth of the country. This is doubtless an exaggerated estimate, but it is probably an under-estimate to claim that all these businesses represent one-fourth part of the entire wealth of our industrial civilization. Moreover, their nature is such that every other kind of business is either directly or indirectly dependent upon them. Their significance becomes at once manifest. The manner in which they are managed must affect very materially the entire population, and in particular the wage-earner.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The policy which in the United States has heretofore been pursued with respect to these businesses has been to turn them over to private corporations and to encourage attempts at competition. There are exceptions which prove the rule. The post-office has from the start been a government undertaking, and, in the East, water-works have generally belonged to cities. A few cities have owned gasworks, and there may be some two hundred cities in the United States owning electric-lighting plants.

The results of the policy are now clearly manifest. First, we observe vast waste. As these businesses are non-competitive, every attempt to force competition upon them means a waste of a great amount of labor and capital. One railway manager claims that if the railways of the country were operated as a unit, the saving would be $200,000,000 per annum. This may be an exaggerated estimate, but the waste is enormous; and when we begin to estimate what it has been in the past in railways alone in the United States, we at once run up into the hundreds of millions. Every one of the businesses named has its enormous waste to show. A single city like Baltimore has easily wasted $10,000,000 in attempted competition in the gas business. The telegraph business in this country and in England furnishes a good illustration of waste through false policy.

A second result of the policy advocated, which now appears plainly, is the enormous and unprecedented inequality in fortunes in the United States. A large proportion of our mammoth fortunes can be traced to this false policy. Had the post-office been private property, we would have had a still larger number of multi-millionaires who would have absorbed a large proportion of the benefits of improvement in that business, the advantages of which have, through public management, accrued to the people at large. Wherever railways have been from the beginning public property, we notice the absence of the so-called "railway magnate." Political sages, like Aristotle, have in all ages told us that excessive inequality of fortune is a social danger, and especially so in a republic.

A third result of the policy mentioned is a growth of artificial monopolies. Businesses which are not in themselves natural monopolies, have, through favoritism shown by railways and other natural monopolies, themselves become monopolies. Perhaps no better illustration on a small scale could be offered than that which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be seen in Chicago in the transportation of baggage and passengers from one railway station to another. It costs now fifty cents to ride from one railway station to another in the only omnibus line whose agents have access to passengers; whereas, if the business were not an artificial monopoly, omnibuses would take passengers from one station to another for ten cents, if not for five. The way these natural monopolies under private management foster artificial monopolies can be seen even in small things, as when an employee of a railway unlawfully drives newsboys from the sidewalk in front of the railway station, in order that the news agent in the station may be secure in his monopoly.

A fourth result is seen in the dependence of the rest of the community upon those who furnish services or commodities of the kind which fall under the designation, "natural monopoly." As these services and commodities are indispensable, those who furnish them can too often dictate their own terms. Residents of cities frequently have to pay street-car companies to make extensions which would be profitable to the street-car companies, without any bonus. The people of the United States were dependent upon railway managers for cheap fares to the World's Fair at Chicago, which cost so many millions of dollars. In so far as the railway managers thought low fares meant increased net earnings, they were reluctantly granted; not otherwise, no, not even as a matter of grace. The people have built many of these railways in subsidies and land grants, but they had not on that account any effective rights with respect to rates. Their relation is one of dependence, and the railways exercise such paternalism as they see fit, the people having abandoned the principle of self-help in railway management. Farmers are dependent on railways to enable them to market their own products and, on the other hand, to bring them their supplies. Workingmen by the hundred thousand are dependent upon these monopolies for wages.

A change of policy with respect to businesses of the kind mentioned is advocated. It is laid down as a general principle that non-competitive businesses should be owned and managed by the government, either national, State, or local, and that competitive businesses are the domain of private industry. As it is not a question, with respect to the business mentioned, whether we will have competition or not, but only a question whether we shall have private or public monopoly, public monopoly is preferred to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

irresponsible private monopoly. The history of the world teaches us that private monopoly is a menace to the public. Men are not good enough to be intrusted with such a despotism as that which monopoly confers.

One of the principal aims in industrial reform must be the elimination of unearned incomes, or rather their reduction to a minimum and a nearer approximation than at present to equality in opportunities. This general aim is in harmony with the clearly expressed views of the founders of this republic, and any effort to carry it out is pre-eminently American, while opposition to the aim is essentially un-American. In the time of our forefathers privileges were largely political. Now the most serious special privileges are economic in nature, but in so far as they discerned special economic privileges, the founders of the republic endeavored to overthrow them.

The change in policy advocated with respect to natural monopolies would go a long way towards the abolition of special economic privileges. The receipt of unearned income is a general expression which covers nearly, if not quite, all peculiar economic privileges, for economic privilege means the opportunity to gain excessive returns. Another term for unearned income is economic surplus, and it is found everywhere in modern society and is the source of a large proportion of all vast fortunes. A recent careful investigation traces over three-fourths of the great fortunes of the country to monopolies of one sort or another. Perhaps two illustrations may make clearer what is meant by "unearned income." Suppose I buy a lot in a city and, without putting any labor upon it, sell it at the expiration of a period for twice what it cost me. The difference between what I paid and what I receive is unearned income, or economic surplus—something over and above the returns to labor and capital. Another illustration is afforded by a street-car company with which the writer is familiar. The dividends are about 17 per cent. on capital actually invested, while bonds of the street-car company, bearing five per cent. interest, sell at about 110. This would seem to show that five per cent. is the normal return for capital invested in street railways in the city where this street-car company is located; but even if we would admit that six per cent. is a normal return on the stock, we still have an excess of eleven per cent. Now, this eleven per cent. is not returned to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor, for wages and salaries have already been paid; and it is not return to capital, for abundant capital can be found which would be content with six per cent. It is then an economic surplus—something over and above returns to labor and capital. Those industrial classes which receive this surplus are privileged classes: they are favored above others.

When it is said that there is such a thing as unearned income, it is meant individually unearned; that is, unearned by him who receives it. Of course, no one enjoys any income for which some one does not toil, and the individually unearned income is socially earned.

A further aim which, it is claimed, the reform advocated would promote is the elevation and purification of public life. The greater proportion of corruption in public life is connected directly or indirectly with natural monopolies. It is absolutely necessary that some control should be exercised over these, but those in charge of these monopolies attempt to escape this control. Sometimes they are unjustly attacked by legislatures, and they use bribery and corruption to defend themselves against injustice; and sometimes they use bribery and corruption to ward off legitimate regulation. Aggression sometimes proceeds from the one source, and sometimes proceeds from the other, but the result is that we have become involved in a vicious circle of corruption proceeding from monopolistic undertakings.

Government ownership and administration of these businesses would tend to the simplification, and therefore to the improvement, of government. Private ownership necessitates endless legislation; and if all laws on our statute-books which have been placed there by such ownership should be removed, the lawbooks of the country would begin to look comparatively lean. How brief and simple is the legislation concerned with our post-office compared with that which deals with railways, for example! Then how largely is litigation connected with private ownership! Remove all litigation peculiar to private ownership and management of monopolies, and the courts would not be so far behind in their cases. Another misfortune is that so large a proportion of the talent of the country is absorbed by private enterprises. Public life does not offer corresponding inducements to capacity.

These are general grounds for the change from private to public ownership, and the workingman is affected, inasmuch as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he belongs to the social body. But we must consider the subject in its more immediate relations to the workingman. It is important to show that this is a reform to which he should direct his attention, rather than to many others which now absorb an undue proportion of his energies.

We are speaking of the wage-earner—the receiver of wages. The monopolist is not likely to be a good employer of labor. His power is so great, and that of a single wage-earner so small in comparison, that the former is exposed to the danger of becoming an arbitrary and arrogant employer. Even when the employees of monopolists unite in labor organizations, their power is not great enough so that they can enter upon labor contracts upon an equal footing with their employers. The outcome of recent railway strikes in the United States demonstrates this sufficiently.

It has been held by some that it should be made a penal offense for those who are employed by railway corporations and other corporations of the kind with which we are dealing, to strike, because the interests of the general public are involved. There can be no question that the general public is concerned, for the services rendered by undertakings of the class called "natural monopolies" are necessities in the modern business world. But, if these wage-earners—the most important and numerous group of wage-earners in the country—cannot resist oppression and injustice in the only way in which resistance is effective, namely, by strong combination and united action, then they are virtually reduced to slavery. The only way out of the dilemma is government ownership. If government is the employer, then the employed have representation in the controlling body ample to protect their interests. It is perfectly legitimate for the people to say: "As we guarantee to you equitable treatment and fair wages, we insist that you shall serve the public faithfully like soldiers. This is only a just return for what you receive."

It is claimed that the policy advocated would tend to steadiness of industrial development. At present, times of great prosperity are followed by times of stagnation, and during the latter hundreds of thousands and even millions seek labor in vain. Government could make far-reaching plans for the development of those industries which we call natural monopolies,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and execute them regularly. A large industrial field for government as well as for private enterprise gives a certain balance to the whole industrial life which must otherwise be wanting. It is to be noticed, also, that a time which is unfavorable for private industry is often a time most favorable for the public undertakings, because labor is cheap and capital also, as a rule. Moreover, government credit does not break down as does that of the vast private corporations with which we are dealing. Reflect upon the great railway corporations which have recently gone into the hands of receivers in the United States! It is unquestionable that enterprises of the sort which we have been considering have, in their failure, had not a little to do with the present crisis.

We may look at crises and consequent industrial depressions from a different point of view. What does stagnation in business mean but absence of exchange? The wheat-grower in Iowa wants shoes, and the shoemaker in Massachusetts wants wheat, but they are not able to supply each other's demands, and both suffer. Now, cheaper and better transportation would facilitate exchanges and thus tend to promote general and continuous prosperity.

The private monopolist fails conspicuously in protection to life and limb, whereas government in this respect manifests decided superiority. Government is peculiarly sensitive in regard to human life. If a government building collapses and destroys a number of human lives, we are astonished and indignant, and those in any way responsible for the disaster are placed in a most unfortunate position; but we take it as a matter of course that railways should every day in the year destroy human life needlessly. In proportion to the number travelling, there are thirteen times as many accidents in the United States as in Germany, where government ownership of railways obtains, and six or seven times as many accidents to employees in proportion to the total number. And no wonder! The first thing which attracts attention in Germany is the careful protection to to life and limb. Accidents of daily occurrence in Chicago are an impossibility in Berlin, a city of equal size. Contrast the efforts of the United States to save life as seen in our truly admirable life-saving service on our coasts with the conduct of those railway presidents who rush to Washington and to our State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitals to prevent the passage of laws to compel the railways to use well-known and approved safety appliances!

It is claimed that there is greater freedom in the service of government than in the service of the vast corporations which manage natural monopolies. And the freedom of the employed may be still further increased by better civil-service regulations. The nobility of public service is of importance to the wage-earner of every grade. The uniform of government is an honor, while the livery of private service is considered a badge of inferiority. It is public service which has developed the great leaders of our civilization. Private service could never give us a Washington or a Lincoln. Government ownership implies use for general social purposes, and not merely exploitation for dividends.

In determining railway fares under government ownership, the question has to be asked, not merely, What will be the net financial returns? but, What will be the total social effect? Recently, what is called the "zone system" has been introduced in Berlin and vicinity, to encourage a decentralization of population. Without attempting to describe the zone system, it may be said that it implies a reduction of railway fares.* It was not merely necessary to ask whether the reduction in fares would yield large net returns, but whether the result would be beneficial, because the railways were public property. It has been found desirable in some instances even to sacrifice a pecuniary return for social advantage of a different sort, which far more than counterbalances the sacrifice in money.

In Australia, with a similar view, school children are carried free on the state railways. Under municipal ownership of street-car lines, the weary workingwoman can receive consideration, and the difference between a three-cent and a five-cent fare need not be considered merely in the light of dividends. The price of gas, electric lights, etc., can, under such ownership, be similarly regarded from a broad social standpoint.

If what Macaulay says is true, and "of all inventions, the alphabet and printing-press alone excepted, those inventions which abridge space have done the most for civilization," then we must favor an administration of railways, telegraphs, etc.,

* Even at the time, it should be remembered, workingmen's trains were running, on which the fare was only two-thirds of a cent a mile.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which aims to place them most fully at the service of the public, making social welfare the chief consideration.

Certain minor reforms would also be accomplished by this socialization of natural monopolies, and one of these is the possibility which it would afford of establishing postal savings banks. The purchase of the railways would involve large issues of government bonds, and these bonds would serve as a basis for postal savings banks. Postal savings banks would in turn furnish an opportunity for the safe investment of money, and would do more than anything to encourage saving on the part of the wage-earner. Experience in England and other countries has shown that no private banks furnish so great an incentive to thrift.

This is a practicable reform. The purchase of the railways would give the property far greater value than the government bonds issued to pay for them, because the consolidation of the railways would at once increase enormously their value. The increase in value would be equal to the saving capitalized, and if we reduce the estimate of $200,000,000 per annum by one-half, we will still have a capitalized gain of $2,500,000,000, even if we capitalize the same at four per cent. We have a further saving which results from the superior credit of government, for this superiority would lead to a vast reduction in interest charges whenever the bonds could be refunded.

The mode of accomplishment, of course, is something which requires very careful consideration; but only a few suggestions can be thrown out at present. One of the most important is that a fair, but never an excessive, value should be paid for the property acquired, and a fair value does not mean simply the cost of duplication of a plant. The policy which has been pursued has been favored by the nation as a whole; and the nation as a whole, and not simply a fractional part of it, should bear the loss. It is largely competition which has led to such enormous expenditures in this non-competitive field, and for this attempted competition the public at large is responsible. If it is insisted that a property should be purchased at the cost of duplication, it makes one part of the community bear the loss due to a false social policy; and, moreover, to urge a hard policy with respect to purchase does more than anything else can to defeat the reform. Of course it arouses against it all those who are interested in these enterprises, and they constitute a large and a very influential

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proportion of the entire community. Not only do they feel their interests attacked, but they are themselves embittered by a feeling of injustice. If it is needed to raise money to carry out the reform, it is suggested that the fairest way to do this is by means of a well-defined system of inheritance taxes, for such taxes diffuse the burden of the change among the community in proportion to ability to bear it.

The importance of civil-service reform in this connection cannot be too strongly emphasized. The reform itself must necessarily bring with it civil-service reform, but at the same time every improvement in the civil service tends to remove current objections to the change. The wage-earners, so greatly interested in these enterprises, will want for their management the most capable men in the country. Is it rational for the general public to desire inferior service?

It would be interesting, were there space, to treat of the relation between socialization of natural monopolies and other reforms. The relation of land reform and the ownership and exploitation of mines in particular would be interesting. But for lack of space it is necessary to pass over these.

To the anti-socialist it may be said that what is advocated is not socialism, but something far from it. A policy which leaves to private enterprise agriculture, manufactures, and commerce is something quite different from a policy which leaves no field for private industry. To the socialist it can be said: "Let us try this reform first. You want this, and so do we. Here is a point of union." To the wage-earner it can be said: "The change proposed is not one which holds out extravagant hope, but it does give a prospect of gradual and steady improvement and is a preparation for other steps forward. Will you not put aside bitterness and contention and unite in measures which tend gradually to bring about the socialization of natural monopolies? Maintain friendly relations, so far as in you lies, with all men. Cultivate peace, patience, and long-suffering. Make haste slowly and secure each step forward. Attend to your individual duties while working for social measures. Put aside envy and jealousy and be willing to learn even from your enemies. While allowing nothing to turn you aside from your purposes, follow these purposes 'with malice towards none and charity for all.'"

RICHARD T. ELY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VILLAGE LIFE IN ENGLAND.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SUSAN, COUNTESS OF MALMESBURY.

LIVING the greater part of the year in English villages, as I have done from my earliest childhood, the daughter of one and the wife of another landed proprietor, I have doubtless seen the pleasantest side of the question, which has lately been agitating public opinion in England and has deprived many excellent and well-meaning—if weary-headed—men of their Christmas holidays, to say nothing of injuring their constitutions by too close a confinement to the heated and exhausted air of the House of Commons. But neither the admirable sentiments of these gentlemen nor their perhaps somewhat less admirable devotion to party exigencies, has so far resulted in anything but the saddest waste of their precious time, and in a cumbrous bill, the working of which no one can foresee and which is calculated to do a great deal of mischief whether it accomplishes any good or not. No legislation can ever change the real nature of the English laboring class. All that can be done is to change their circumstances, and it is most curious to compare their present position with that which Cobbett, the grammarian and friend of Tom Paine, describes in his *Rural Rides*. In his days the rural population was as differently situated from what it now is, as that same period differs from the times of serfdom, when the smallest offences were punished with mutilation and death. It is a good lesson in the steady progress of civilization in England to read the opinions which were the cause of Cobbett's exile to America, and many of which might now be held by any Tory-Democrat among us without reproach.

Even within my own recollection, the spread of education, and the high standard of attainments required of national schools by the school board, have had an immense influence—and that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not altogether for good—on the rural laborer. It is, I believe, physiologically certain that the present inferiority of skilled workmen is due, in a great measure, to the fact that they are detained in the national schools beyond the time when they ought to have already begun to learn their trade, before they have lost that elasticity of the brain which enables it to develop freely more in one direction than another under the influence of the daily exercise of a special set of muscles. Thus, and thus only, can the real handicraftsman be made; and if you keep a child up to the age of thirteen entirely at his lessons, precious time has been lost which he can never wholly regain. In addition to this, it is certain that in country villages—and no doubt in towns, too—children are pushed beyond their powers of learning. Underfed and thinly clad, they have not stamina to support labor which it would be hard for a seasoned brain to endure. I remember visiting one day a poor woman about one o'clock, the usual dinner-hour among the poor. My own meal was at two, and I thoughtlessly stayed on talking to her until one of her children, home from school, and who had been hovering anxiously about, at last could stand it no more, and hiding his face in her apron, burst into tears: "Mother, my bit of bread!" That was all he had to work upon from 9 A. M. till 12, and again for several hours of steady work in the afternoon. I was going home to a meal of several courses, most of which I should probably leave on my plate if they were not cooked entirely to my satisfaction.

Many poor women have complained to me of the over-wrought condition of their little children; how they wake up feverish in the night, crying that they are unable to learn their lessons. On the other hand, it would be difficult now to find any one under thirty unable to read or write; but in the year 1887 a curious event took place, in my own parish, in a remote part of Somersetshire, which proved to be an exception to this general rule. I was at this time called from my new home in Hampshire to attend the funeral of a friend in Somerset, where I had spent my girlhood. In spite of my distress I noticed that the parish clerk, who was leading the responses at the side of the open grave in the little churchyard amongst the Quantock Hills, had a very odd voice. The sad ceremony over, I turned to see what could be the matter with this man, who used to be my combined terror and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admiration as a child—and behold! it was a woman. In the whole parish there had not been found one man who could both read and *raise*, as it is called, the bell, two absolutely imperative duties for a parish clerk. My old friend had, therefore, appointed his daughter to officiate, being himself crippled with rheumatism, and this, in spite of opposition, it was found he had a legal right to do. The new parish clerk was a pretty, prim little woman in a plain black dress and a neat white tie, as like her father's as she could possibly make it.

This little village was then, and is still, the home of many superstitions disregarded elsewhere. I remember well the parish witch, whose life would several times have been sacrificed had it not been for my father's constant protection. Everything that went wrong was attributed to her. If cattle fell ill, she had "overlooked" them; if the farmer fell out of his gig after too convivial a market day, she had "ill-wished" him. There was nothing, from the birth of a new baby to the crowing of an old hen, that that unfortunate woman had not had a hand in. Finally one night the cottage in which she lived was fired and burnt to the ground, she herself escaping unhurt, while her daughter was crippled for life. I need not say that those who formerly had only "misdoubted" her were now absolutely certain that she had a good friend down below, and from that time they dared not openly attack her again. I used often to sit with the poor old woman and read the Bible to her, but I suspect she sometimes found it useful to keep up her reputation as a past-mistress in the black art.

"Wise women" play a great part in village life, "stroking" and "saying a prayer" being part of their method of healing. Many a man has solemnly assured me that he has been completely cured by the wise woman who passes her hand two or three times over the affected part and mutters a few sentences. These are admitted to be "good" words, and she has nothing to say to the devil. It is certainly strange that workingmen, to whom idleness means starvation, and who can be treated free of cost by the parish doctor, should prefer to pay the wise woman for her services if she does not really relieve them.

I never knew until years after I had left my early home, that I had myself established a reputation in this direction. It came to pass in this way. My father, being tender-hearted about the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sufferings of animals, undertook to teach his men not to kill the harmless glowworm, which is so like a snake, and which too often pays for that mischance with its life, whenever it is foolish enough to allow itself to be caught napping in the sun. He therefore took one of these creatures and gave it to me, saying to his men: "Do you think I would put a venomous reptile into my daughter's hand?" No reply was made, but years after one of these same men asked me whether I would teach him the prayer I must have said that day over the snake to kill its poison!

It is sad to think that most of the old English customs are fast disappearing. Village fairs, once held in almost every village in the southern counties, are now hardly ever heard of. Only in the north the larger horse fairs flourish as much as ever. Formerly the fairs held in the village I have mentioned, and many other surrounding spots, were the excuse for the whole neighborhood to turn out in their best clothes. Booths and merry-go-rounds were set up on the green, and there were dancing and fun till a late hour in the night. Increased means of access to the county town, by better roads and easier vehicles, has spoiled these country outings, where now no business can be done.

Life in most villages is carried on under much the same conditions. There is a squire or principal landowner, of greater or less degree. He lives in a "court," "manor," "castle," or "hall," according to his ancient family and state or modern acquisition of wealth. The farmers round about are his tenants, and he and they employ the inhabitants of the village. In one such as I describe, poverty—real poverty—is, so to speak, unknown, although the pinch of need is sometimes felt. Still, when sickness and trouble come upon the laborer, his employer, the squire, will always hold out a helping hand to tide him over a bad place. Public opinion would be very much against him if he did not; and I cannot call to mind any case where a laborer has been allowed to starve or go to the workhouse when he had faithfully served his master for a number of years.

A farmer cannot, of course, afford to give his men the same wages as his landlord, and it is here that want and suffering come in, particularly since bad times have overtaken the agricultural population. Farmers give from eight to twelve shillings a week in the southern and more than that in the northern counties, but they will sometimes discharge their men in the winter or put

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them on half-pay. How, then, can a man with his wife and children live? One shudders to think on what they keep body and soul together. This lasts for a time, and then the workhouse or starvation stares them in the face. Still the farmers' wives must drive a pony carriage and wear a sealskin, while their daughters are too fine to milk the cows and churn the butter, as their grandmothers did, but instead sit and play on a jangling piano. Therefore, naturally their dependents suffer, and "farming does not pay."

The parson is a very important factor in the parish, and much depends upon his tact and management of the resources of the place. He is naturally at the head of the village temperance club, which is open to workingmen during all the winter months, and the various charities are under his superintendence. There are in this, as in all other professions, men who do their duty, and men who do not; and this must always occur under a system where everything depends on the individual. The Church of England has, no doubt, of late years, roused itself and turned out good and active men who give up their lives and work hard in a profession where prizes are few and poverty the rule, but dissent has a strong hold on the rural mind, and the emotional services in chapel are too often more attractive than the parson's plain-sailing discourses on your duty to your neighbor. Vivid descriptions of himself and his friends in the flames of eternal perdition are fearful joy to the laboring man, and his parish church is mostly rather empty. Still, when he comes to be married or buried, "parson" is the man applied to.

Among the other inhabitants of the village there is always the blacksmith, the carpenter, both of them well-to-do unless they drink; and the village postmistress, the dispenser, as the legend outside her door will inform you, of "tea, coffee, tobacco, and snuff." She also drives a brisk trade in groceries, which she sells at famine prices to the poor, excusing herself for this proceeding by the number of bad debts among her customers and the long credit she is obliged to give to families out of work. The net result, however, is that in a few years she mostly makes a tidy little fortune.

The ordinary squire employs, let us say, from half a dozen to a dozen men as gardeners, woodmen, and underkeepers, and he has, of course, his head keepers and head gardeners. These latter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are naturally paid on a different scale to the others, have superior houses, allowances, and perquisites of their own, while their wives and daughters hold their heads very high indeed. I wish I could say the same of their skirts, which trail through all the mud of the lanes. To teach you what mud and a lane can be, no counties can compete with the "primrose paths" of Devon and Somerset, although it is no longer, as a rule, necessary to harness a cart-horse in front of your carriage horses at the foot of a hill, or take them out and then go back half-way up a steep hill because you have met some one coming down, and there is neither room to turn nor to pass!

Ordinary day laborers are paid from eight to sixteen shillings a week, and are generally allowed in addition a cottage and garden valued at eighteenpence, for themselves and their families. The difference in wages depends upon the employer, gentlemen in the southern counties hardly ever giving less than twelve, which rises to sixteen, shillings in the case of skilled wood or axe men. The under keepers and game watchers are mostly paid on the latter scale, as they are more exposed to night-work, to say nothing of attacks from poachers which may injure them for life. An ordinary head keeper would get about thirty shillings a week, his house and garden; generally a cow is kept for him that he may have curds for the young birds he rears, and he has often fire-wood and coals, these latter being always hauled for him, an expense he could ill afford. These wages are of course immensely increased by tips he receives from visitors who come to shoot with his master and who rarely give less than "gold," or sometimes "paper," which, I might remind American readers, means nothing under a five-pound note.

In large properties the agent plays a great part in village life, and here again much depends on his personal tact and temper, squeezed as he is between the tenants on the one side and the landowner on the other.

Of the many burning questions which of late years have taken so much from the charms and happiness of country life, there is none more fraught with irritation to both rich and poor than the game laws, which are scarcely even second to rights of way in their power of creating ill-feeling between the different classes. Yet, if the preservation of game were given up, hundreds of men would be thrown out of employment, all kinds of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wild birds would soon be exterminated, and large quantities of valuable food lost to the community, almost the only article of diet left us now in which we do not compete with foreign countries at a hopeless disadvantage.

I remember once in a village near Christchurch I had gone into a cottage, leaving my pony, cart and groom in the road outside. All at once I was startled by the sound of hoofs, and, on running out, saw the backs of two men in a cart, fast disappearing in the distance, their horse galloping at full speed. "What is that?" I cried to the groom; "has the horse bolted?" "No," answered the groom; "they are flogging him along. I saw their faces and will swear to them anywhere." Just then a game watcher came up exhausted, breathless, and as pale as death, saying that a keeper had been knocked down and was lying badly hurt farther up the road. He said they had caught two men poaching pheasants, had taken a short cut and made a rush for the horse's head as they were making off in their cart, which had been left in the lane close by. The poachers knocked down the keeper, drove over him and galloped away. I went at once to the rescue of the wounded man, but before I got up to him was assured by his fine flow of language that his injuries were not serious, although he was covered with blood. That evening the groom was confronted with the two poachers, who had been traced in the mean time, but during the interval he had, I conclude, been got at, for he refused to identify them and I was unable to do so, having only seen their backs.

Of late years one of the worst troubles the landowner has had to contend with has been the steady and undoubted tendency of all younger agricultural laborers to flock to the larger towns for employment and leave their country homes. Many reasons are assigned for this—low wages, want of constant work, bad cottages, and above all that restlessness which a half-and-half education gives, with the desire for excitement and a town life. As regards the latter, that is a disease of the world rather than of a class, and incurable even by the change to a city, where they carry their discontent, and find that with higher wages they have heavier outgoings and are no better off. As for wages, in counties where the laborer is most highly paid the statistics of the Labor Commission show that he will not remain, and the same is the case with cottages which are in some places disgracefully bad

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in others quite habitable, the result as to discontent and departure being identical. If, however, the people have once tasted city life never again can they return to their old simple habits—they are forever unfitted to settle again in their village homes.

It is true that machinery has reduced the amount of labor required to an immense extent. I have seen two fields of corn about the same size: one with a McCormick reaper, drawn by a horse and managed by a man and a boy, was cut and stacked long before the other, where I counted fifteen persons at work. It is also a fact that women work much less in the fields than they used to do, with the result that they are greatly deteriorating in physique; while those of the upper class who have taken to outdoor sports have gained in height, breadth, and health. In Hampshire they will not even do a day's washing for hire, or help in the kitchen at a pinch. They prefer to sit at home and knit woollen gloves, by which they can with difficulty earn sixpence a day.

It is possible, we are told, for a laborer to put by, but I must say, to me it has always seemed beyond his power; and one cannot but feel that an estate on which a man has spent his labor, his youth, health, and strength, should support him in his old age. This, as I have said before, is the rule with the larger and more well-to-do employers of labor, but in many cases at present the landlord is very hard hit; heavy taxes, competition, reduced rents, and increased demands for repairs and improvements hamper him on all sides, and he cannot, if he would, be generous.

It is an awful thought that a life of honest and unremitting toil may land a man at last, through no fault of his own, in the workhouse, and set the seal of failure on a past without reproach. I feel convinced that this fact lies at the root of all labor troubles, and no legislation which does not accomplish something towards smoothing this difficult and thorny point can prove of any lasting benefit. To overturn the social coach is only to block the road for traffic, and gets one no further on one's way; but that the heavily burdened and sorely tried classes who depend on land in England should stand side by side and bear their privations together seems the only loyal course, while they possess their souls in patience and hope for better times.

SUSAN H. MALMESBURY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOME INDUSTRIES AND THE WILSON BILL.

BY CHARLES STEWART SMITH, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; EDWARD KEMBLE, PRESIDENT OF THE BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; A. K. MILLER, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW ORLEANS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; AND W. H. DIMOND, PRESIDENT OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

CHARLES STEWART SMITH, ESQ.:

PROTECTION VS. FREE TRADE has been a good political war-cry in times of election, but there is not now, and never has been, any considerable number of men in this country who believe in actual free trade.

It is the settled conviction of a large majority of our people that, excepting the revenues derived from the internal taxes on whiskey, tobacco, and beer, which might well be increased, the necessary provisions for federal expenditures should be collected from foreign imports; and this opinion prevails among all political parties irrespective of their views regarding the merits or demerits of protection as an economic policy. To state the matter briefly, the people of the United States in general, believe in continuing the policy of indirect federal taxation by the agency of the custom house which, in the main, has prevailed since colonial times.

If the foregoing statement be true, then it logically follows that any political party in this country which may impose an income tax upon the people will display a profound genius for blundering, and must bid a long farewell to official power and influence.

That this is the teaching of experience is proved by the verdict of history concerning the income tax during our late war. No

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one who was familiar with its operations will deny that it was inquisitorial and called into being and supported a small army of spies and informers, that it was odious to the people and promoted lying and perjury, and finally that it was an unjust distribution of the burdens of taxation. It was only tolerated as a war measure, and was abrogated by common consent and with evident relief to the whole country.

The nation will hold the party in power responsible for providing the ways and means to carry on the government and enable it to discharge its obligations promptly without resort to an income tax. No one who can read the signs of the times will deny that it requires small gift of prophecy to foresee that those members of the House of Representatives from the North and West who recently voted for the passage of the income tax amendment to the Wilson bill will be judged by the country and rejected at the next Congressional election.

The proposal not to tax incomes under $4,000 per annum is an obvious attempt to promote class distinction in legislation, and is socialistic and vicious in its tendencies. The tax would be borne by less than one-fifth of one percentum of the population of the United States. While we are not in favor of a federal tax upon real estate, yet we believe that a far better method for the support of the general government than an income tax would be a tax upon all the land in the country, as well as upon the improved real estate. Such a tax would bear upon all classes alike and would not be subject to the demoralizing influences that invariably follow an income tax. It would also have the great advantage of being more easily levied at less expense and with less opportunity of defrauding the government.

If we omit the income tax, to which the distinguished author of the tariff bill has given an unwilling consent, the Wilson bill is an honest attempt to carry out the views and professions of the party in power. The declaration of the unconstitutionality of a protective tariff by the late Democratic convention was an utterance unworthy of a great party, and no one in or out of it seriously believes in the declaration or proposes to act upon it.

It is only fair to consider the difficulties which Mr. Wilson and his associates necessarily encountered in framing a reduced tariff measure and at the same time providing a sufficient income

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to meet the largely increased needs of the government. The Committee on Ways and Means met at the outset the enormous extravagance of the late pension legislation, which added within the last twenty years one hundred and thirty millions to the annual expenses of the nation when most of the principal actors in our civil war had passed away. In 1873 pensions paid were twenty-nine million dollars; in 1883, sixty-six million dollars; and in 1893 one hundred and fifty-nine million dollars.

In addition to this, the prolonged effect of the silver heresy seriously complicated the work of the tariff reformers. A very distinguished authority, Mr. Edward Atkinson, of Boston, says:

"I think it is safe to say that the delay in dealing with this question (silver) has cost this country ten per cent. upon its annual product of the present year at the very least, or from one to two thousand million dollars."*

The serious mistake of the Committee on Ways and Means was in presenting a bill which did not provide sufficient revenue to pay expenses without the addition of an odious income tax. This error might readily be obviated by an increase of the taxes on tobacco, whiskey, and beer, and a moderate duty also on tea and coffee, all of which would bear lightly upon the consumer. On these England readily collects a large revenue.

Another grand error of the Wilson bill is the placing of sugar on the free list. This practically does away with the advantages of our reciprocity treaties with more than thirty millions of Spanish-Americans on our southern borders, and in the judgment of the great free-trade statesmen of England this action is the giving away of a real advantage for nothing and is only repeating what Lord Salisbury characterized as the blunder of Great Britain. Other mistakes in the schedule may be criticised, such as putting cotton-ties on the free list, and placing substantially the same article used for baling hay in the schedule subject to a duty of 35 per centum, but this error and others of like nature will, we trust, be remedied before the bill receives the signature of the President.

There is nothing that commerce fears so much as change and uncertainty concerning the laws which affect commercial transactions. The delay in the Senate in passing the silver repeal bill

* This estimate of Mr. Atkinson does not take into consideration the enormous losses arising from the depreciation of corporate stock, bonds, or other securities, a part of which may be recovered.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practically ruined trade last fall or deprived it of all profit. It is now greatly to be feared that a like delay in settling the tariff question will seriously damage the commercial prospects for the coming season. Whatever may be the ultimate fate of the Wilson bill, it should be decided promptly, in order that commerce may know what the law is, and adapt its operations at once to the changed situation. If, in order to save the spring business, it were politically practicable for the Wilson bill (not including an income tax) to be passed at once by the Senate, with an understanding on the part of both its friends and opponents that sixty days be given to the consideration of reasonable amendments, which might be subsequently adopted, a large part of the bill would in the public mind be considered as definitely settled. The country would then know at once what to depend upon as far as the main features of the bill are concerned, and business, now at a standstill, would move on.

CHARLES STEWART SMITH.

EDWARD KEMBLE, ESQ.:

THE new tariff bill, commonly called the Wilson Bill, can no longer rightfully be considered as imposing an adverse influence, either material or general, upon the business situation of the country. The suspense, which was of some consequence pending the utterance of the bill, has disappeared and is no longer a factor in the situation. There are, of course, some individual and a few corporate interests which may await with some anxiety the final adjustment of some of its provisions; but so far as the general business of the country is concerned the bill has no weight now—not even the weight of suspense. Its enactment into law would not produce a ripple. The business community is prepared for it, and it has been accepted as a foregone conclusion. Is has not been much more than a bugbear at any time, and the claim made by some that it is still a weight on the situation cannot be sustained.

In periods of depression men look for a cause, and are very likely to jump at a conclusion. The cause of the present depression in business—now long continued—was at first said to be the purchasing of silver by the government: so the purchasing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clause of the act of 1891, commonly called the Sherman Act, was repealed. Then the financial panic—or semi-panic—was said to be the cause. That soon passed. Then the trouble was attributed to the scarcity of money. Now there is a plethora of money. Later the cause was said to be the expected new tariff bill. This bill has been before the public for weeks, and the worst is known. These so-called "causes" have all disappeared, but their disappearance has not put a wheel in motion nor a hand to work. It is not, perhaps, within the scope of the greatest intelligence to account satisfactorily for the present state of affairs. It is world-wide. Its beginning may be traced to the time, three years ago, marked by the failure of the Barings. Next came the crisis in Argentine affairs. Then, shortly, the panic in Australia; and later this wave of depression over the United States, which does not yet recede, although the supposed causes have been eliminated.

What is most wanted, I submit, to change the situation is *demand*. There has been an absence of demand. All see that. How can there be prosperty anywhere without trade demand? What stopped demand, or reduced it? It has been said by a good authority that demand stopped because the mill stopped, and the operative and the wage-earner were left without money to buy with; and that the mill stopped because a new tariff was to be made. But demand existed before the mill was built; and because of it the mill was built. Moreover, is it reasonable to suppose a mill will stop while demand continues, tariff or no tariff? Demand must stop before the mill stops and the operative goes out. Let it be remembered that operatives and wage-earners are not the only buyers, either. Is it not better to say demand has stopped because the people have not so much money as formerly to buy with; that they have not so much money because values have declined, and that these values have declined, in most cases, because of superabundance, for there seems to be a superabundance of almost everything? So every one receives less money for his produce or his labor, or from his investment. Is not this a reasonable proposition? Take, for illustration, one of the natural products of the country—wheat. This article is of less value to-day than for forty years, and because of a superabundance of it throughout the world. The proposed tariff does not concern the value of wheat. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

farmer is receiving very little for this article, perhaps forty cents per bushel. How, then, can he be the customer for other articles, and in other ways, that he is when he is receiving eighty cents per bushel, which he often does receive? Is it to be believed for a moment that if one have the money to pay for an article, and wants it, he cannot get it; that if the demand is made on the dealer he will not supply it; that if the manufacturer is called upon for his production he will not make it, because there is to be a change in the tariff?

It was not the buying of silver by the government, nor the tightness of money in the financial centres, nor the expected new tariff, nor all these combined, which caused demand to stop, and, later, the present state of business, although they all unquestionably had some influence in the way of aggravating the situation, and making it more embarrassing than otherwise it would have been.

There are connected with this proposed new tariff two important matters, namely, that of revenue and that of wages—neither of which is it proposed to discuss now. Its effect on the first can be figured out with reasonable accuracy by the government experts, and no doubt this has been done. Its effect on the other, of course, must remain undetermined. But it is by no means certain that a reduction of wages will follow its enactment; or, if such a reduction does follow, that it will have been caused by this tariff. The question of wages is to be one of the great questions of the future, in any event, and must be settled by itself. It is recalled to mind in this connection that some years ago, when hides and leather were made duty free, the cry was raised that wages would be lower in consequence and that many of the tanneries would be closed; but nothing of the kind occurred. The previous standard of wages was fully maintained, the production of leather increased, and it became an article of export and is so to-day. Wages probably depend more upon the skill or the ability of the worker—and they ought to—than upon any tariffs or other laws.

Demand will bring prosperity; the absence of it produces depression, and during periods of depression various weaknesses and defects and errors are brought to light which create a want of confidence and intensify and prolong the situation.

It is probable that the present crisis has already been turned,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that from this time forward a gradual improvement in business affairs will be observed, whatever may be done with the so-called Wilson bill.

EDWARD KEMBLE.

A. K. MILLER, ESQ.:

THE New Orleans Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the Wilson tariff bill in its present form. In our opinion, it was too hastily prepared, and is therefore crude and ill-conceived, not following any distinct or intelligent economic policy, but full of contradictions and mistakes. The majority in the House seems to be impressed with the idea that a radical tariff measure ought to be passed; and with this idea it supported the Wilson bill, without sufficiently considering what its effects will be. We believe that it is most untimely, as it will greatly aggravate the industrial and financial disturbances from which the country is suffering, and delay its recovery from them; and we know that it will carry such ruin and disaster to the most important interests of Louisiana as to cause a serious crisis here, one that will necessarily make itself felt throughout the country.

A great commercial city like New Orleans is interested in having trade as free as possible, and as little trammelled by tariff taxes and regulations; and the mercantile classes would naturally favor any legislation having these objects in view. They expected and desired an intelligent tariff measure; one that would provide the government with sufficient means to pay its debts, and that would stimulate foreign trade, but would do this without injury to our home manufactures, without lowering the standard of wages, or increasing the already excessive army of the unemployed.

The Wilson bill has not fulfilled these conditions. It fails in two of the essentials of an intelligent tariff measure, for it does not provide the revenues needed, and seeks to eke them out by an unpopular tax, whose results we cannot count on; and it would prove an undoubted shock to many, if not all, our industries, already in a somewhat demoralized condition, and requiring encouragement rather than a blow. Coming at this moment, when the country is in a disturbed condition industrially and financially, when the factories are only just beginning to get to work again, it would unsettle them once more and revive the crisis. We cannot speak authoritatively of other sections or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cities, but we can say of Louisiana at least that the Wilson bill would create a crisis here far worse than that we are now passing through, and the whole country could not but feel its effect.

It is bad surgery to perform a dangerous operation on a patient still weak and just recovering from a serious illness. Yet this is what the Wilson bill proposes to do. Our business and manufactures could not stand the shock. It is difficult to see how the many Alabama and Tennessee iron furnaces which were closed last year by the depression in the iron industry, can hope to re-open for years to come, in the face of the iron schedule, which will make the manufacture of iron even less profitable; or how the sawmills of the Southwest will begin work again if the Western markets are closed to them by the lumber schedule, which turns these markets over to the Canadian lumbermen.

But without going to other sections, and confining ourselves strictly to Louisiana, whose industrial condition we know, and about which we are able to speak authoritatively, we can say that it would be difficult to exaggerate the disaster that the passage of the Wilson bill would bring to Louisiana and New Orleans. Louisiana has confined itself largely to a few industries. Its sugar crop gives employment to at least two-fifths its population. Next in importance is its lumber industry; the latter is engaged largely in the manufacture of cypress lumber, the greater portion of which goes to the North and West. It is the opinion of millmen that the lumber schedule, which would open the country to free Canadian lumber, would, on account of the high freight rates now prevailing, completely shut out the Louisiana mills. A number of them are already closed. They will scarcely be likely to re-open under the Wilson bill.

It is, however, the sugar schedule which would precipitate the most severe financial crisis in Louisiana, and render any good provision the bill contains nugatory and of no avail. Nothing is more clearly established by the most searching and careful consideration, than that sugar cannot as yet be produced as cheaply in Louisiana as in Cuba, with its slaves and coolies, or in certain countries of Europe, where labor is ill-paid. The lowest price at which it has been manufactured in Louisiana —and that only in large plantations, backed by abundant capital—is 3.5254 cents a pound, and the average cost of production for the past eight years has been 5.027 cents. Sugar of this quality

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is sold in New York for three cents a pound. If the Wilson bill became a law, it would be impossible to raise a pound of sugar in Louisiana without loss. Sugar is the chief crop in twenty-two of the parishes of Louisiana, and an important one in several others. It constituted this season half the total value of the agricultural product of the State, and supported directly 350,000 persons, and indirectly 125,000 more, in the rural districts of the State. In New Orleans it contributed more to the general prosperity of the city, and gave employment to more persons, than any other single interest. Two-thirds of the work done in the foundry and machine shops and boiler factories is for the sugar plantations, and two-thirds of that in the cooperage. Half of the agricultural machinery and nearly half of the coal, and mules, etc., are sold to them. If the large number of persons employed in the refineries, the fertilizer factories, on the steamers engaged in the sugar trade, and in loading and unloading them, be included, it would make a total of 8,000 to 9,000 men in New Orleans, and 40,000 to 50,000 people—one-fifth the population of the city—dependent on the sugar industry for support. If the Wilson bill was passed and destroyed that industry—and it would have that effect beyond all question—these men might tramp elsewhere to look for work, but what would become of their families ?

The Wilson bill would be for Louisiana almost as ruthless an act as the devastation of the Palatinate, which a century ago ruined thousands of industrious farmers and mechanics and filled all the capitals of Europe with beggars. The disaster might be set right in time, but it would be years before this could possibly be accomplished—years of suffering and destitution.

The alluvial lands of the Mississippi are the most fertile in the world, but their fertility renders them unfit for many crops. Cotton grows too luxuriantly—becomes a tree instead of a shrub, and yields little lint. They cannot produce wheat or compete with the West in the production of other cereals. They will grow indigo, as formerly, but chemical dyes have rendered this crop unprofitable ; rice, but we are already raising more than we need ; early fruit and vegetables, but the supply is also excessive ; and finally sugar, for which it is best fitted. The crop is growing larger year by year, the yield per acre better, while the cost of production is materially less.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is now evident that if the United States pursues for five years longer the policy it has followed since the birth of the government—either the Democratic policy of a duty on sugar, or the Republican policy of a bounty—it will be possible to raise enough sugar in this country to supply all our needs, and keep at home some hundred million dollars which now go abroad each year; and to produce it as cheaply here as in any land on the globe where slavery does not prevail. We cannot compete with slave labor—the Emancipation Proclamation has rendered this impossible. In 1891–92, Louisiana produced 357,875,557 pounds of sugar; in 1892–93, 445,857,840; in 1893–94, 667,127,450; an increase of 86 per cent. in two years. The yield per acre increased from 1,782 to 2,602 pounds in this period, and the cost of production fell from 4.6225 cents a pound to 4.128.

It is not necessary here to discuss the question of the pledge of the United States under which so much capital was invested in the sugar industry. We are discussing only the effects of the Wilson bill, and these would be such in Louisiana as to render it impossible for the Chamber of Commerce or any other commercial body of New Orleans to favor it as long as it contains its present sugar schedule. To do so would be to advocate and uphold the murder of an entire community. That single schedule would add nearly half a million persons to the already overswollen army of the unemployed and destitute who are clamoring for bread and appealing to the charity of the world. It would cut down the population of the State nearly one-half and that of New Orleans one-fourth, and it would fill the Southwest with beggars looking for work and food.

This section of the Wilson bill is against every principle of justice; a violation of the pledges of the government; a breach of political economy; opposed to the doctrines of the Democratic party, which is now in control of the country; and against the interest of the whole people. It is a departure from the usages of over a century, and would render it impossible to reap the fruit of any good provision the bill may contain.

The Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans cannot approve it, and must earnestly antagonize it, in its present shape, as dangerous to our industries and the prosperity of the country, and well-nigh fatal to Louisiana.

A. K. MILLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. H. DIMOND, ESQ.:

THE effect of the Wilson tariff bill on the commerce of San Francisco must be considered from the standpoint of the greatest good to the greatest number. Features there doubtless are that, from a personal point of view alone, seem to invite the merchants of this city to forsake the doctrines of McKinley for those of Wilson. These points practically are "free coal" and "free iron." It will be well to show first the reasons for desiring the admission of these articles free of duty.

With the exception of coal mined in Washington, which is inferior to that produced in the adjacent British Provinces, and a small quantity of still less value as fuel mined in California, the immense amount of coal consumed here annually is of foreign production. Of the $1,000,000 duty on coal collected by the Government last year, San Francisco paid $800,000. Iron and steel ships for government and merchant service have been successfully built here in competition with the East. Machinery of all kinds, agricultural implements, the expensive and elaborate plants for mines, for the reduction of ores, machinery for lumber and sugar mills, etc., are turned out in San Francisco and adjacent cities, of a quality and in a quantity surprising, when the obstacles to be surmounted are considered.

To these industries the boon of free coal and free iron would be great. It is even possible it would stimulate the shipping business somewhat by enlarged importations, while any stimulant to the interests named would possibly slightly increase the number of wage-earners and incidentally enlarge the home market for the agriculturalist. This, to the San Franciscan, seems to be the extent of the benefits offered this section by the Wilson bill.

Now turn to the reverse side of the question.

California produced upward of 36,000,000 pounds of beet-sugar last year. In this business capitalists have not only invested immense sums in building refineries, but men of modest means have been attracted to this State by the prospects held out in this branch of agriculture, so that now hundreds of families are dependent upon the sugar-beet for a livelihood. Their all is invested in land exclusively used in raising this vegetable. Unprotected, this industry cannot live. Free sugar means ruin to this most promising enterprise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The refineries of this city are furnishing the territory west of the Missouri River with their requirements of refined sugar, and in 1893 thus supplied over 339,000,000 pounds. Duty free, China would soon undermine the trade, and claim the western half of the United States for their market. Twice, before the McKinley Act went into effect, the Chamber of Commerce of this city, in most urgent terms, appealed to Congress to retain the tariff on sugar. This chamber, the representative mercantile body on the Pacific Coast, still adheres to its original opinion on this subject, and the belief is general here that the present deficiency in the national Treasury is largely due to the abolition of this duty, which heretofore produced no considerable part of the general revenue.

To sum up: The beet-sugar territory of the Central States and the Pacific Coast, combined with the cane-sugar regions of the South, properly protected, can in a few years—comparatively speaking—supply the wants of the entire country and make it independent of foreign resources. From a Californian standpoint the United States cannot afford to destroy this promising exotic by exposing it to the cold blast of free trade.

With four million sheep in this State, yielding an annual clip of about 30,000,000 pounds of wool, and San Francisco also handling much of the wool of adjacent States and Territories, it is natural that a large element in this community is opposed to the free admission of the foreign-grown article.

California and New York are the leading sources from which supplies of barley are drawn. Canada is a keen competitor for the trade in the East, and her proximity to the great consuming markets of the Atlantic and Western States gives her an advantage that, were the duty removed, would drive from those markets California barley in spite of its admitted superiority.

Twenty years ago no raisins or prunes were produced in California. In 1893 there were 63,000,000 pounds of raisins and 46,000,000 pounds of prunes to the credit of this State. On merit alone California can hold her own, as each of the products named is now recognized as the best obtainable. However, owing to cheap labor and low freights from primary points, the French, Spanish, and Turkish goods can be profitably laid down in New York at prices that would bankrupt the California grower. Protection to these goods, therefore, is vital.

Winemaking in California has reached a state of excellence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that requires protection; principally on account of the large capital, in round figures $100,000,000, invested in the various branches of the industry in this State. The excellence of the vintage is so well recognized that last year 11,726,165 gallons and 38,781 cases were shipped to the Atlantic States. Our wine, therefore, should be protected against foreign and adulterated products.

Only 30,144 flasks of quicksilver were produced in California last year, a sad shrinkage owing to the monopoly held by the Rothschilds, who control all sources of supply except California, and now regulate the price throughout the world. It is believed they have used their best endeavors to control the output here also, where now only those mines rich in ore, and owned by men of heavy capital, can operate at all. Remove the present duty and it is doubtful if they could compete with the foreign article. The belief is that they would subside into a state of coma, to revive when American capital was forced to release its holdings, when they would become part of the great quicksilver monopoly which rules in London.

With a belt of timber on this coast that apparently will last for centuries in spite of the supreme efforts of lumbermen to convert it into building material, but with a timber belt on the British Columbia side more accessible, and frequently of better average quality, the Pacific Coast lumberman cannot hold his own with fair wages to white men against the Chinese labor and favorable natural conditions at the North. There is between the American lumberman on this coast and ruin, simply the slight tariff now in force on imported lumber.

To multiply such illustrations is but tiresome repetition. Return to the opening proposition, "the greatest good for the greatest number"—we of California recognize we must sacrifice something for the general good, as each section must, in arranging a tariff that will be fair to the nation as a whole. While, therefore, selfishly approving of free coal and free iron, we realize that it may mean great injury to other sections, and we also know the withdrawal of protection from the vast interests referred to above means ruin to us, and the overwhelming sentiment of the mercantile community of San Francisco and California is that the changes proposed by the Wilson bill work injury to the leading interests of California, out of all proportion to promised benefits.

W. H. DIMOND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DRAMATIC CRITICISM.

BY BRAM STOKER, M. A.

THE ultimate importance of dramatic criticism is shown in the amount of space allotted to theatrical matters in the journals of the day. It is the duty of newsmongers to supply the want of the public, and it may be fairly taken for granted that if there were no demand the supply, even if continued, would not have a perpetual growth. In both England and America there is on every great newspaper some official to whom is entrusted the collection and editing of theatrical news. In America this individual has a definite position as "dramatic editor." His work is aided, if not simplified, by the existence of the "press agent," now generally attached to every prominent theatre, who supplies to him items of interest presumed to be of importance by the advance agent of what is known as an "attraction." Thus it will be seen that in this great mass of theatrical material, chiefly composed of exchange matter, rumor, and gossip, there is a special need that the judgment set forth as that of the newspaper itself, through its experts, should be accurate and adequate. It is the critical little leaven which is to leaven the whole lump. This is not only possible, but easy, of achievement, since the multiplying of the necessary number of writers leaves the critic proper to attend to his own work, whilst the dramatic editor and his staff do all that may be required in the way of making straight the path of the coming players. In fact the critical Dr. Jekyll need have no connection with the rumor-bearing Mr. Hyde.

What, then, should be the equipment of a dramatic critic and his intellectual attitude whilst addressing himself to his task, it being taken for granted that he must obey all those rules which the experience of ages has formulated for the guidance of critics generally, whilst at the same time he gives special heed to those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other rules, dependent on the *differentia* of dramatic as distinguished from other art ?

Ordinarily a critic should have primarily a sympathetic understanding of the matter on which he sits in judgment :

> **A perfect judge will read each work of wit**
> **With the same spirit that its author writ.**

How much more necessary is this spirit when that which the critic reads is writ in tone and action on a page of passing emotion—all as swift and evanescent as a wind-sweep across still water. And yet there are here and there to be found writers, who take so harsh, so illiberal, or so jaundiced a view of their high calling that, to use Fielding's phrase, they construe the Greek word for criticism in its legal sense only—condemnation, instead of judgment. The arts are liberal, and from their very essence require not only a tolerant understanding of their aim and method, but a generous appreciation of even their lesser efforts and their minor issues. The world would be but a poor place after all were it not for the arts ; and it is a poor art indeed which cannot tend toward the advancement of some ideal. That artist is indeed low down in the scale of human excellence whose labors do not brighten and beautify, or at least soften the harshness of things. Of all the arts, that of acting requires the most sympathetic understanding; for, though the means of its expression are of the subtlest, being through the exercise of the powers of God's last work—man, its happenings are so quick and so impalpable that before they can be well exposed to the influence of foreign judgment their very memory is temporarily obliterated by the exercise and purpose of succeeding emotions. It is here that some understanding of the actor's intention becomes of importance ; for unless the judge either has some previous knowledge of it, or allows his own sympathy to move as freely as its subject, it can hardly be possible for him to grasp the idea of a consistent character working always through one individuality, and yet subject to varied passions and emotions. But the dramatic critic has to study, follow, absorb not only one character under varying aspects and conditions, but each and every character in the play; so that if his brain be already loaded with theories, and if his sympathies be already choked with antagonistic purposes, he is little apt to arrive at that great truth,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whatever it may be, at which the actor and the audience are conjointly aiming. In this matter of quickening sympathy the best lesson in criticism comes from the audience whose swift and accurate judgment is shown every now and again by the spontaneous cheer, which shakes the playhouse and justifies in a way the action of that gifted scribe who, crystallizing public sentiment, first turned enthusiasm into an active verb. And yet there are instances of men who seem completely blind to the value of sympathy in criticism, and approach the matter in a seemingly hostile spirit. I know, for instance, of one dramatic critic—dramatic critic and translator of plays—either so perversely stupid or so lamentably ignorant of the very first principles of his calling as to write thus: "The actor, however little he may like to be told so, is a parasite upon the play." If his statement were metaphysically true, what a slur he, a critic, has cast by inference upon his craft; for if the actor be a parasite upon the play, what, in the name of logic, is the critic, who earns his bread or pursues his mission by writing of the actor?

> **Great fleas have little fleas upon their backs to bite 'em,**
> **Little fleas have lesser fleas and so *ad infinitum*.**

"It is a dirty bird," says the old English proverb, "which fouls its own nest."

Again, the critic of the drama should have at least some special knowledge of the subject of his work, unless, of course, he be one of those gifted individuals whose omniscience is intuitive, or he have that which must not be expected of any man, a sufficient modesty to hide his own ignorance. For the dramatic critic has to judge not only the player, but the play! and a play is a mightily complicated piece of work. As it has to appeal to all or most of the senses, it has everywhere a bearing on some branch of human knowledge, since the eye has to be pleased and satisfied, beauty as well as accuracy has to be observed, and the production of a play in an educated age is no light task. In external scenes the flora of place and season have to be correctly given—the scene painter who knows his work must even study the characteristics of cloud and atmosphere. The historical period, the nationality, and the social degrees of all concerned have to be accurately shown; even the habits and bearing of an age and country are of importance. These things all mean very special study somewhere,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and when painters and historians have carefully collaborated with management and actors, it requires a learned critic to be able either to fully appreciate or to justly condemn what is shown. The spread of archæology has been mainly aided by the stage, for it has been by the wholesale setting forth of the environment of a period or an event that the great public has come to have familiar knowledge of such matters. In such a mass of material as a stage setting requires it is comparatively easy to find a flaw; but this is a very different thing from the conception of even a crude idea upon the subject. It is, I think, hardly too much to say that it will take the most superior judgment to be found in England or America to fitly and fully appreciate the work of a great play properly produced, so as to enable the writer to translate and point out its excellences to the vast body of the—incompletely—educated public.

Let me here say that, speaking with a considerable knowledge of dramatic criticism and dramatic critics in both England and America, I can bear willing testimony to their general worth. I have found them to be, as a body, earnest, liberal-minded gentlemen, sympathetic in their attitude toward the work, patient and fearless in their discharge of it, having no private purpose or end of their own to serve, but helping to enlarge the public sympathy and to purify the public taste by their appreciation of excellences and their condemnation of evil things.

So far, however, as we are informed, neither is there any special supply of heavenly fire to enlighten dramatic critics, nor are they or their body specially exempt from the evils that assail mankind. All callings have their less worthy or unworthy members, and the ranks of dramatic criticism have no special immunity from such. Further than this, it is probable that this body has more than its fair share of undesirable individuals, since there is no preliminary test of capability. The calling is an open one, needing necessarily no qualifications except the will of a newspaper proprietory. Thus there are to be found, here and there, fortunately at rare intervals, in the body of dramatic critics, as in all bodies, members of the criminal class, of the asylum class, of the hospital class—in fact of that class generally of cranks and faddists, whose place in the world of criticism is somewhat analagous to that occupied in the scheme of law by what are known as "torts," a class of civil offences, with a possible criminal bias.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The distinctly criminal class is represented by a few individuals who are venal to the praise of unworthiness, and who have a blacker side of crime in that they extort, where and how they can, blackmail in money or in "meal or malt" by either disseminating or withholding libel. These men are but few; and as they are pretty well known to every one in the theatrical and journalistic world, I cannot but think that an organized effort for their suppression by the men whose craft they sully would have an immediate and wholesome effect.

The critics of the hospital and asylum classes are harmless unless when they have some personal interest to serve, some spite to indulge, or some wound to their vanity to avenge: in such case, the pity which the reader of average intelligence has for them changes to a purposeful contempt. These cases are, however, rare; for as a rule the dramatic critic whose existence is built on vanity or *cacoethes scribendi*, or both, is harmless and is fully sheltered by the magnitude of his own incapacity.

Finally, the class of cranks or faddists includes certain varieties whose differentiation is a matter of almost entomological interest. The most common specimen is that of the "provincial" writer. This individual is gifted with a sort of impregnable cocksureness, and to him nothing is hidden, for he reads the whole Arcana like an open book. His logic being of the purely feminine order—"I think; therefore I know"—has to him no possible flaw, for his vanity supplies the blanks that his ignorance has passed, and his self-sufficiency covers up with a blinding glory all doubts as to fact. In some of the most intellectual centres of the English-speaking world such specimens are to be found, and it is to them that the word "provincial" can be most suitably applied. "Provincial" as an adjective is not geographical, but comparative. It implies a narrowness of vision or an intolerance of spirit tacitly taken to arise from inadequate experience. To eyes accustomed to the eternal passing of the great pageant of life the various items have only the importance of their place in the great scheme; but to eyes not so trained by habit each item seen by itself becomes of undue importance; and, inasmuch as lesser towns but seldom see these greater movements of the world, the opportunity of comparison does not exist in a measure sufficiently large to become of permanent educational value. Thus the comparison of a "provincial" with a "capital" view of things

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

becomes instructive, and we are enabled to fairly test the intellectural value of those who, though enjoying the opportunities of larger culture, find themselves—or rather are found by their readers—eternally limited by their provincial littleness. The work of a "provincial" critic speaks for itself, and who runs may read the signs. For such a man loves to display his knowledge, and the sum of human knowledge is so great, and the amount of it which one person can acquire is so small, that the measure of his capacity can be gauged by the importance which he places on certain things which, though well known to others, are to him fraught with the weight of new acquirement. Thus, we may occasionally see an otherwise completely commonplace criticism speckled over with isolated chunks of the writer's previously disintegrated ignorance. More commonly still one may notice comparisons made by such writers between existing things and others of which they are manifestly ignorant, and always to the detriment of the former. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico.* The most usual examples of this form of provincialism in dramatic criticism are those of comparison with foreign countries, as when American or British dramatic art is unfavorably compared with the glories of "the French and German schools," or when players of the day are held up as wanting in the excellences of the actors of the past—Garrick and Kean being the most commonly chosen examples, since they are well known names, and none living has seen them play. The purveyors of the foreign comparison are usually to be found in inland towns or cities, where they have had life-long residence, and they are generally as ignorant of the French and German tongues as they are of Tamil or Telugu. Those gifted beings who are enabled to raise the veil from the past or to evolve from their own inner consciousness the minutiæ of the art of Garrick and Kean—and the methods of these two players probably embraced the whole cycle of histrionic art—are as a rule either very young men without either thought or experience, or else more hardened sinners in the ways of conjecture and in the vice of self-esteem. In either case they are manifestly in absolute ignorance of the principles, the aims, the limitations, the difficulties and the practice of the art upon which they sit in judgment. They simply draw upon their inchoate imagination for their nebulous facts. Any one with experience or knowledge of individual writers of dramatic criticism will recognize the justice of this description

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and easily identify, if such be worth while, the writers of this class.

As to the best method of achieving proper dramatic criticism on the part of those who are in all ways equipped for their work and perfectly unprejudiced in their desires, I should venture to suggest that in the case of a new play or an important revival of an old one the critic should not take as the field of his judgment the efforts of the first performance, when through the nervousness which is a necessary part of the artistic temperament many phases of effort are of necessity seen at their worst. He should wait until by a few repetitions the work of the various artists and operatives has been properly consolidated and smoothed. The occasion of a first performance is the opportunity for a descriptive reporter who can be eyes and ears to the reading public, rather than for the expert critic whose province it is to analyze and sit in judgment upon the play and the playing as seen by the great public during the progress of a run.

There is in the world no more honorable, no more responsible position for any man than to sit in judgment, and such an one should always feel the gravity and the weight of such an earnest task.

BRAM STOKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRISONS IN THE OLD WORLD AND THE NEW.

BY MAJOR ARTHUR GRIFFITHS, HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTOR OF PRISONS.

GREAT diversity of practice prevails among the nations with regard to the penal treatment of law-breakers. In the Old World three principal methods obtain, each used singly or more or less in conjunction with the others.

First, the system of penal exile following or associated with imprisonment; secondly, the separate or solitary system, in which a prisoner is subjected to varying, often lengthy, terms of isolated, cellular confinement; and, thirdly, the progressive system, in which the prisoner may pass through several stages, beginning with the treatment indicated in the second, but earning in longer sentences the privilege of labor in company and of achieving conditional liberty. The first of these methods is practised by France, Russia, and Portugal; the second by Belgium, Holland, and latterly to a limited extent by France; the third is the system prevailing in Great Britain, in most of the English colonies, in Austria-Hungary, and theoretically also in Italy or only in part. A fourth method has been devised in the New World, which has attracted considerable attention, in the first instance, on account of its originality and its ambitious programme, more recently because one of its chief agents has been charged with barbarous practices and arraigned at the bar of public opinion. But the system commonly known as that of Elmira should be taken as something independent of and apart from the conduct of its administrator. The new principles involved deserve attention even if in practice they may be wrongly, perhaps cruelly, applied.

Before contrasting the various methods just mentioned, it will be well to give some account of each, so that the reader, after a careful examination of their aims, processes, and results, whether

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alleged or established, may realize what makes most effectively and conclusively towards the great end of all penological science. That end is obviously the proper protection of society and the approximate eradication of crime.

Some exact appreciation of the expression "crime" should precede discussion as to its treatment. Crime has, perhaps, been best defined as the failure in certain individuals to live up to the standard deemed binding by the rest of the community. The criminal, the law-breaker, is really a rebel, an insurgent; one who rises against established rules, who defies them, whose hand is against his fellows, respecting neither their persons nor their property, and attacking them according to the predatory instincts or the dictates of his own sweet will. It is not necessary to consider here the grounds of this antagonism; they may be traced to inheritance, to perverted moral sense inherent and unexplainable, they may be due to neglect in childhood, caused by pernicious example and training. In whatever way he has been produced, the criminal is an actual entity, a very inconvenient and embarrassing living fact, very puzzling to deal with rightly, both in the best interests of society and with due regard to the dictates of humanity, two very different but not incompatible aims. The question of dealing with its criminals has long vexed Christendom, and still remains in a measure unsolved. It is greatly complicated by differences of opinion as to what principal objects should be sought in penal treatment, whether it should rather seek to punish, deter, or reform, or all three, or each in what degree. That penal reprisals should be vindictive and painful, that an offender should be made to suffer in person, should actually feel the punishment inflicted upon him, is still largely held, although the average tone of modern thought does not greatly approve of the principle. But it is defended on the grounds that unless the penalty is irksome it misses all effect upon that far larger class, the potential criminal, who is likely to be deterred by the knowledge of what actual criminals have endured. This effect at deterrence beforehand is surely quite as important and really more humane than the attempt at after-reformation, which is often attempted without result. It cannot be less meritorious to keep the weak-kneed from falling than to set him on his legs again by some alterative and curative process.

For the first of the methods already indicated little can be said

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in commendation. The plan of penal exile, of deportation or transportation beyond the seas, has never largely effected any one of the three great aims of penal treatment. In theory it may mean much. The removal of the criminal from the metropole to a new and more or less distant territory where the worst social elements might find space and encouragement to redeem their past, was a fascinating and seemingly logical idea. But it failed altogether when put into practice. Australia was not developed by penal colonization, but in spite of it. Many convict exiles no doubt prospered greatly, but their success was a reproach to the methods by which that success was secured. When England was forced by her colonies to abandon transportation it already stood self-condemned as ineffective, unequal in its incidence, inordinately costly, and injurious to the locality. France, which adopted the system rather lightly and with complete disregard of English experience, has had to face precisely the same failure. New Caledonia has not contributed much to that colonial expansion which was and still is the dream of so many French politicians. Exile is, after all, only a temporary riddance of a large percentage of criminals who return untamed to repeat their depredations at home. No effective discipline can be enforced at such a distance. The worst convicts are relegated to colonial prisons, in other words are sent some ten thousand miles to endure a punishment that could be better inflicted at home; the best are emancipated in the colony to form an element greatly complicating all the conditions of colonial life. The same evils greatly intensified are to be observed in Siberia, upon which the Russian government has long directed a stream of penal exiles, under circumstances as regards human suffering unparalleled in the history of the world. But Russia still clings to transportation and is now preparing a newer and perhaps more ghastly disappointment in attempting the penal colonization of semi-Arctic and inhospitable Saghalien.

The second method, of inflicting irksome and more or less prolonged imprisonment, is claimed by those who practice it to be the most consistent and the most largely effective of all penal systems. It is seen at its best in Belgium, a small, compact, and prosperous country, which has spared no pains or outlay in perfecting its prison arrangements, and which is held up by some as a model for universal imitation. There is nothing novel in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disciplinary methods of Belgium. They may have improved upon the original invention, but that was first seen in the Quaker State of Pennsylvania at the commencement of the present century. Solitary confinement, as then devised, caused much controversy; but the system was as warmly defended as it was strongly condemned, and it was adopted wholly or in part by many of the countries in the Old World. As it exists to-day in Belgium, in Holland, and in France, where it has but recently been introduced, it has lost nothing of, but rather gained in, that peculiar form of severity which originally produced such an outcry against it. The isolation is complete and continuous. The inmates of a prison never see each other; their only human intercourse is with the officials, the governor, chaplain, schoolmaster, trade instructors, who visit them, no doubt, often, but cannot be called companions. Closely hooded when at large, exercising strictly alone in a small, triangular slice of yard, hearing divine service through the open cell door, cut off from all and everything but their ghostly advisers and taskmasters, the Belgian prisoner thus spends any period of incarceration up to ten years. After that he is permitted to pass into association if he pleases and if he has sufficient wit left in his poor addled brains to make the choice. The curious visitor will find constantly in the great prison of Ghent a ward full of imbeciles, the degenerate products of a strictly enforced, unduly prolonged solitary system.

The injurious, often fatal, effects of this kind of treatment, which was also tried in England, led there to the sharp curtailment of the period for which it may be inflicted. Practical experience proved that a maximum of nine months was as much as a prisoner could stand of solitary confinement. It has since been contended by competent authorities that this period might be slightly prolonged, but the isolation inflicted in English prisons has never been of the same absolute and unvarying kind as in Belgium. Chapel service and exercise have been in associated view of one another, although freedom of speech has never been permitted. This limitation of the most severe portion of the punishment became a sort of starting-point for the formation of the progressive, or third, of the systems in force in the Old World. It had been found in the latter days of Australian transportation that the convicts who had undergone a preliminary period of cellular confinement before exile were much more amenable, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did generally better in their new land. The treatment was retained with some little modification when convicts were perforce retained in home prisons after transportation ceased, and nowadays the rule of separate, or cellular, imprisonment obtains in all English prisons for short periods* and for the earliest stage of longer sentences. In the second stage a convict, or "penal sentence prisoner," whose sentence may be from three years upwards to life, passes at the end of nine months to a "public works prison" where he is employed with others in out-of-door operations, the construction of some work of national utility. This second stage is the stepping-stone to the third, that of conditional liberation, the license to go at large, before the completion of the sentence, a privilege which can only be earned by steady and continuous industry. The freedom thus gained is not absolute; the licensed convict is still under the surveillance of the police, he is bound to report himself to them at regular intervals until his license expires, and he is subjected to sharp penalties, including prompt relegation to prison if it is found that he misuses the privilege accorded, even to the extent of contemplating fresh infractions of the law or of consorting with bad characters.

Although it never has been proved that crime is greatly affected by the penalties it entails, both the Belgian and British systems can take a certain credit from the fact that crime has undoubtedly diminished in those countries. During the last forty years in Belgium the number of convictions has decreased. While there were 7,000 in 1850 to a population of four millions and a half, in 1889, with a population of six millions, the total was 4,634, and in the previous decade it had been still lower. In England the decrease has been much more remarkable. It has been greater and more continuously downward. Between 1878 and 1893 the population of the local or "short time" prisons has fallen from 20,833 to 13,178, and yet during that period the general population of the country has increased by quite four millions. During almost exactly the same period the convicts or those undergoing long sentences of penal servitude have also decreased in numbers; where in 1878 the total population of the convict prisons, male and female, was 10,671, in 1892 it had fallen to 5,247, these numbers including convict lunatics, and a few

* This, according to the letter of the law, might extend to two years, but the later months of such a sentence are seldom if ever passed in a cell.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

survivals of transportation in western Australia. The strangest decrease has been in the female convicts, who in 1878 numbered 1,402, and in 1892 only 375.

It is plain, therefore, from these few figures that in any comparisons between British and Belgian methods, the former can show the largest results. No doubt other causes have contributed to this decrease. In Great Britain it has been largely effected by the almost universal practice of judges and jurisdiction of shortening the terms for which imprisonment is inflicted. Again, recent legislation empowers justice to withhold sentence on first offenders, who go at large escaping all punishment unless they lapse a second time. Both of these agencies are largely in force in the two countries last named, although very generally adopted elsewhere. Another potent cause in the gradual diminution of criminals is the care bestowed upon neglected youth. Child-saving is felt to be a more effective treatment than adult correction. Lastly, the wide-reaching efforts of charitable societies are now very usefully directed to assist the discharged prisoner, tiding him over the first dangerous period when temptation is strong, relapse too easy, helping him to honest employment, and encouraging him to continued exertion by timely but not demoralizing support.

That such other agencies have been called in to assist proves that the curative action of imprisonment has not been relied upon alone. Yet prison discipline has an undoubted effect where it is applied, as in Belgium and England, with certainty and uniformity. These are comparatively small countries, where centralized administration can establish and enforce a particular system. The offender knows exactly what measure will be meted out to him; he cannot hope by crossing a boundary line to exchange severity for comparative ease. In whatever prison he finds himself, his diet, labor, discipline are always precisely the same, and if the irksome penalties of prison life are thus uniformly inevitable, they are in a measure counterbalanced by the safeguards which protect the prisoner from excessive harshness or ill-usage. The prisons are governed in the strong light of public opinion, which, especially in England, is always on the alert and ready to take up any grievance, real or supposed. A further guarantee is afforded by the constant watchful supervision of both independent and official inspectors. In England

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the local magistracy, although no longer concerned with administration, control discipline and hear complaints. A very systematic monthly inspection also takes place, made by experts who look closely into the treatment of all prisoners.

With such arrangements, with duties so carefully performed by competent and highly responsible supervisors, there can be little fear of scandal or malpractices. Anything like continuous misusage of his charges such as that of which Mr. Brockway has been accused is all but impossible in the best organized prisons of the Old World. The alleged case against the superintendent of Elmira is that he maintained authority and accomplished reformation by repeated use of the lash. The "paddle," or instrument he is said to have so freely, even so brutally, wielded, is said to have been seldom out of his hand. According to his accusers he was like an old-fashioned pedagogue who flogged anybody and everybody on the slightest excuse and with the smallest, possibly no, provocation. With us nothing is more closely checked than the infliction of corporal punishment. Evidence of the offence charged must be taken on oath before a committee, or some superior official other than and much above the governor or warden of the gaol, and this higher authority can alone order a prisoner to be chastised. How rarely this bodily penalty is imposed in English prisons is shown by the annual reports published by prison boards and presented to Parliament. In the convict prisons where the daily average population in 1892 was 3,969 males, the lash was used only 45 times, and always for assaults on officers and aggravated acts of insubordination. In the "local" or shorter term prisons in the same year the corporal punishments were 129 with a daily average of 11,504 males. In Belgium and France corporal punishment is not practised at all.

It is scarcely possible to contrast the prison system of the United States with any of those already described. There is no one acknowledged system in America, nor can any such be established except by some federal union for prison purposes such as is so strongly advocated by reformers. Till then an extraordinary variety of practice must prevail ranging between the two extremes of over much elaboration and possibly of mistaken aims and absolute neglect. The first extreme is found in that Elmira reformatory whose management has been recently so gravely impugned; the other in the South-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ern convict camps or in the county jails, many of which have been forcibly stigmatized as "with few exceptions, moral pest-houses—mere nurseries of infamy, where, without regard to age, sex, offence, or sanitary laws, unfortunates are indiscriminately impounded."

That a great country which once led the van of prison reform should to-day lag so far behind is more its misfortune than its fault. Grave social and economic difficulties have no doubt hampered the question of penal treatment in America. It has been complicated by the constant influx of comparatively poor immigrants, the admixture of so many alien races with the native born, the presence of the negro element which has supplied a large percentage of the worst crimes. The rapid growth of territory again, the pressure upon young communities to establish more useful institutions, the continual strife of political parties, and the continual change of officeholders have largely affected the question. It has been for the most part grappled with in only the oldest States, and not always comprehensively in them.

The State of New York may be credited with the invention of what is now known as the Elmira system. It was probably based upon a theory first put forward by some Italian *savants*, that the penalty inflicted upon an offender should be indefinitely prolonged, and should only end when the individual had given reasonable assurance that he was cured of his criminal ways. This is now the well known "indeterminate" sentence, the uncertain term of imprisonment which nominally leaves the prisoner's future entirely in his own hands. This system, which has now been in practice since 1876 at Elmira, claims to have achieved important and extremely satisfactory results. I leave altogether on one side the stigma cast on the Elmira Reformatory by the recent investigation. Mr. Brockway's methods may be impugned, but the system established must be judged by other tests than the conduct, good or bad, of its superintendent.

The question really at issue is not whether Mr. Brockway was a hard and cruel master, but whether the method, discipline, treatment, call it what we may, has had an appreciable effect in reclaiming criminals, and thereby diminishing crime. The answer of the Elmira managers is unhesitatingly in the affirmative, and the assertion is grounded on the fact that inmates "paroled" after proof given of amendment have not again, save in the small-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

est percentage, relapsed. The result, vouched for in all seriousness, seems incredible, but before disputing it, and to gainsay the statement is difficult in the absence of accurate and extensive statistics, it is well to examine the process which has worked such wonders.

Most of my readers are probably familiar with the method in force at Elmira and cognate establishments, but I will recapitulate it briefly. The individuals to be subjected to its regenerative treatment are first offenders of between sixteen to thirty years of age, selected as likely to benefit by the treatment. This treatment is essentially educational: intellectual, physical, and technical. The mental training covers a wide range, extending from the elemental instruction of the kindergarten to the study of ethics, languages, and the higher mathematics. The "inmates," for the word "prisoner" is strictly eschewed, are trained also in social and scientific polemics. A taste for rhetoric is cultivated, and one especially gifted with eloquence was intrusted with the 4th of July oration at Elmira in 1892. The physical treatment is as thorough as the intellectual; beginning with drills and military exercise, it continues with gymnastics until the pupil becomes as "fit" as a prize fighter, as active as an acrobat. Last of all the industrial education, to which the others obviously subserve, proceeds with marvellous rapidity. The inmate with his perfected body and highly developed brain masters the intricacies of some trade or handicraft with extraordinary promptitude and facility The manipulation of strange tools, the application of special machinery, the niceties of technique, present no difficulties to him. Within a short year or so Elmira turns out first-class workmen in such slowly acquired trades as printing, gilding, decorating, brass moulding, boatbuilding, horseshoe making, photography, and many others. Elmira at first sight seems an admirable seminary; its curriculum is so extensive and knowledge is so readily imparted that parents and guardians might be forgiven if eager to secure its advantages for the honest youths under their charge.

Here a critic finds the first weak spot in the whole system. If these marvellous results are really obtained,—and there is no reason to question them, despite the stories told of the "paddle" and the red-hot hooks used to fish the recalcitrant out of their cells,—they are surely too valuable to be the peculiar appanage of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the criminal class. There are thousands of honest folk who would be delighted to undergo the Elmira course; who would face cheerfully a short imprisonment if they might in due time make up for a defective early education, acquire free of cost a remunerative handicraft, and issue thus largely endowed to take up employment found them by their philanthropic patrons. The effect produced by Elmira may yet prove to be the very reverse of that anticipated; instead of diminishing, it may prove a direct incentive to crime, so long as a criminal conviction is the indispensable qualification for admission to the reformatory school.

The champions of Elmira and places of its class seem, however, satisfied that they do useful work in reclaiming those who are still susceptible to reform, whose failure from virtue, however serious, indicates no determined criminal bias. The advice, experience, and personal knowledge of relations and friends is sought before deciding who shall be subjected to the wholesome and beneficial treatment, so that beforehand there should seem reasonable hope of its success. The precaution is a wise one, as is shown by the results claimed. But here, again, a sceptical mind may be disposed to cavil. The figures shown in the last report make large pretensions. They tell us that since 1876, the year of Elmira's birth, 5,899 inmates have been committed to it, of whom 3,289 were "paroled," the balance being men with finite sentences; 2,689 of the 3,289, or 81.8 per cent., are supposed to have done well. It is with the evidence on which this statement rests that we are disposed to find fault. Proof of this reform is the result of six months' supervision after parole, during which time the ex-Elmira patient has been found, in the percentage stated, to have refrained from further misdoing. But surely the test time has been exceedingly short, and criminals who keep straight when watched have been known to lapse when left uncontrolled.

In any case, whether or not the Elmira cure is radical or evanescent, the changes produced have not been very appreciable on the sum total of American criminality. It may be argued that there are not enough of these new reformatories; that when the system is more widely adopted there will be far less crime in the United States. The assumption may or may not be borne out by the experience of the future. At the present moment, reformatories notwithstanding, crime advances with ever-increasing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ratio decade after decade, as is plainly shown by the careful statistics prepared for the last census by Mr. Wines. This increase may in part be explained, perhaps, but the balance is sufficient to contest the present usefulness of Elmira methods.

The most remarkable feature in the Elmira methods is the prompt effect they take. Although the sentence imposed is called "indeterminate," it appears to be very definite and determinate indeed. The average period of detention runs from fifteen to twenty months, no great time for the inculcation of so much, the eradication of much more—of that moral perversion which unchecked or persistently indulged in has at last ended in crime. Can it be supposed that a couple of years' teaching, the chief agent relied upon according to the Elmira managers, has sufficed for complete cure? Or can it really be that the terrors of an uncontrolled despotism have "persuaded" the inmate to learn his lessons and amend his ways where milder measures would have failed?

Until further experience can establish larger results altogether independent of the harsh measures alleged to have been used at Elmira, it seems probable that the older prison systems will still hold their own, and that European nations will not generally adopt the indeterminate sentence and the latest invention in reformatories.

ARTHUR GRIFFITHS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

BY THE HON. NEWTON C. BLANCHARD, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE government of the United States is pursuing, on a somewhat extended scale, a system of river and harbor improvement. Both the great political parties have recognized the soundness of this policy by substantially indorsing the same in their national platforms. No question is now more fully settled than the right and duty of the government, within proper limitations of economy and public necessity, to facilitate commerce by all appropriate public works.

The value of the great natural highways of our country to the people who now inhabit the United States, and to the generations who will follow in the occupancy of its territory and the control of its destinies, cannot be over-estimated. Nature has done much for North America as regards facilities for transportation. Great oceans on either side and a great gulf on the South offer their pathways to her people; on the North her inland seas, containing one-third of all the fresh water of the world, stand unrivalled among the lakes of all countries; and her numerous rivers lie ready to hand, "awaiting only the application of steam to vessels to render them magnificent highways." To be more specific, we have, approximately, 23,000 miles of dangerous coast line on the two oceans and gulf. We have the two greatest inland waterways on earth—the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River and its tributaries. The rivers of America are the largest on earth. After the Amazon and La Plata, comes the Mississippi, with a discharge per second of 250,000 cubic feet at low water, to over 1,000,000 cubic feet at high water. This mighty river is equal in bulk to all the rivers of Europe combined, exclusive of the Volga. It is larger than the Yang-tse-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kiang and the Ganges, the greatest rivers of Asia, combined. It has forty-four navigable tributaries, and the aggregate navigable length of these rivers is 16,090 miles—more than four times the length of the ocean line from New York to Liverpool, and more than four times the distance by rail across the continent from New York to San Francisco.

The rivers emptying into the Pacific Ocean give us, in addition, 2,351 miles of navigable streams; those flowing into the Gulf of Mexico, other than the Mississippi, 2,870 miles; and those flowing into the Atlantic Ocean, 2,874, miles—making an enormous total of 24,185 miles of navigable rivers, lacking but little of being long enough to belt the world, and constituting an incomparable system of inland water transportation. These waterways were formed and presented by nature at no cost to the people, but they are just as valuable as if artificially constructed. They belong to the nation, and should, like its custom-houses, post-offices, military roads, and other property, be kept in good condition and repair.

To navigate these waters, we built, according to a competent authority, during the thirty years ending in 1890, 1,747 ships and barks, 575 barges, 12,423 schooners, and 17,359 sloops and other small craft—a total of 32,104 sailing and unrigged craft, representing 5,159,605 tons of tonnage; and during the same time we constructed 10,652 steamers, having a total tonnage of 2,864,066 tons—giving a grand aggregate of 42,756 craft of all kinds, having a tonnage of 8,023,671 tons, and representing an average annual addition of 1,379 vessels of 258,828 tons to our carrying fleet.

The records of the census give the fleet for the census year at 8,917 sailing vessels, 6,067 steam vessels, and 10,561 unrigged craft, making 25,545 vessels of all kinds, of the aggregate value of $215,020,336, to which must be added $25,000,000 for shore property, making a total of $240,020,336—a vast interest earning $145,000,000 for the year, employing wholly or partially during the year 240,288 persons, and paying out in the same time for expenses $115,000,000, of which $40,000,000 (in round numbers) was for wages.

The Census Bureau was able to gather reports on only about 90 per cent. of the traffic fleet, yet the report of operations by these is a remarkable one, the freight moved having been no less than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

108,078,320 tons, the number of passengers carried having been 199,079,577, and the aggregate mileage the vessels reporting travelled to accomplish these results having equalled 106,456,164 miles.

The value of the exports and imports of the United States for the census year 1890, carried in American vessels, was $202,451,086, and the value of that carried in foreign vessels was $1,371,116,744, making a total of $1,573,567,830. This vast commerce is benefited directly by the improvement of our harbors, and indirectly by the improvement of our internal waterways. But this was only our foreign commerce across the oceans. Let us glance now at the freight movement on our inland and coastwise waters. This is grouped by a competent authority* as follows:

	Tons.
Freight movement of the Great Lakes, wholly domestic	53,424,432
Freight movement on the rivers of the Mississippi Valley, wholly domestic	29,405,046
Domestic commerce on the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico	72,705,973
Domestic commerce on the Pacific coast	8,111,278
Making a total of	164,646,729
Add to these figures the of canal traffic,	20,747,932
And we have a total freight movement on our inland waters of	185,394,665

all of which is benefited directly by the expenditures made in the improvement of our waterways and ocean ports.

From this exhibit of foreign commerce on the ocean, and of domestic commerce on our inland and coastwise waters, it must be admitted that there is ample justification for the liberal policy of river and harbor improvement upon which the government has entered. But this is not all. If there were not a pound of freight carried upon the waterways, the benefits derived from their presence would be incalculable, standing as they do a menace by nature to all artificial competition and free to all who wish to use them for transportation purposes upon equal terms with minimum opportunities for pooling or discrimination—the great evils to-day in every other means of communication and transportation.

It is true, the railways now carry the largest portion of the freight formerly transported by river or lake, but they are compelled, by river and lake competition, to carry such freight during the season of navigation at very low rates. The waterways are the most powerful possible regulators of rates upon the railways. It is

* Mr. Thos. J. Vivian, Transportation Statistics, United States Census.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clearly shown by statistics that the lowest freight rates are found upon railroads most subject to water competition, and these rates ascend or decline according as navigation is free or interrupted.

The saving, therefore, to commerce arising from our waterways and their improvement comes from the resulting low rates of freight, and its money value must be calculated not only from freight moved by water, but also upon freight moved by rail in competition with the water routes. The effect of water transportation, it will thus be seen, is both direct and indirect. It furnishes the shipper with cheap rates, and, also, by its competitive influence, forces the railways to lessen charges. A diminution in freight charges of one mill per ton per mile on the railways of the country effects a saving of nearly a hundred millions annually to shippers in transportation charges.

It must be conceded, then, that upon our inland waterways depends most largely the realization of cheap transportation. Cheap transportation affects the welfare of both the producer and consumer. The competition among commercial cities is so great that a trifling overcharge in rates of transportation may cost the loss of an important market to the producer, and the trade of an important section to the particular market. Unobstructed navigation of the lakes and interior rivers, and deep water ports on the Atlantic, the Gulf and the Pacific coasts, means cheaper food, cheaper clothing, cheaper iron, coal, lumber, and cheaper supplies generally to every inhabitant of the United States.

No class of general legislation has, probably, been subjected to more severe and continued criticism than that enacted for the support and development of our internal and seaboard commerce by the improvement of our rivers and harbors. And yet it is probable that no distribution of public moneys has conferred more common and lasting benefits upon the people and upon the industries of the country at large. Nothing is more necessary to the development of a country and the advancement of its people than cheap, safe, unobstructed, and reliable transportation. Particularly is this true of a country like ours, with widely separated boundaries and diversified natural resources, where manufacturing industries and their sources of supply are often thousands of miles apart, and where centres of population are far removed from the agricultural regions, which supply the necessities of life.

The total amount appropriated for rivers and harbors from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beginning of the government, in 1789, to the present time is, in round numbers, $240,000,000. What a small sum when compared with the amount of the present cash valuation of the railroads constructed in the United States since 1830 (say), $5,000,000,000! It is a remarkable fact that the total amount expended for river and harbor improvement hardly equals what is paid out in one year at the present time for repairs and rolling stock on the railways of the country.

For some years from the beginning of the government, improvement of our waterways was limited to sea-coast harbors and salt-water tidal streams. Later, John C. Calhoun, the leader of the strict constructionists of the Constitution, looked upon the Mississippi River and declared it "an arm of the sea," justifying the improvement of its navigation by the Federal Government on this ground. Inland and westward the advancing tide of population, of trade and commercial industry and activity, pushed its way, rendering the utilization of our other rivers and lakes necessary, and directing attention and care to their navigation. As more rivers and harbors were taken in hand, as more projects of improvement were entered on, a corresponding increase in appropriations for this purpose became necessary. In 1822, the first general appropriation for the improvement of rivers and harbors was made, amounting to $22,700. From time to time, appropriations of this character continued to be made, resulting in the expenditure of $14,700,000 prior to 1860. In the decade between 1860 and 1870, the aggregate appropriations were $12,789,182; between 1870 and 1880, $68,035,656; between 1880 and 1890, inclusive, $108,613,066; and since 1890, a little over $35,000,000: making a total of $240,000,000 in more than a century for purposes of great public improvement.

Contrast this sum with expenditures for like purposes by other maritime nations. Our neighbor, Canada, with about one-twelfth of our population, and with resources and wealth in no wise comparable to ours, has expended on her transportation routes (lakes, rivers, canals, and railways) more than $300,000,000, including nearly 1,300 miles of railway constructed and equipped by the government.

England has only 1,300 miles of coast line—not much more than one-twentieth of what we have. Yet she expends $20,000,000 annually upon the same; $30,000,000 has been expended on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Clyde, which is but a rivulet compared with the Mississippi; and $82,000,000, all told, upon the Mersey, which is but a spring branch compared with the mighty "Father of Waters." Upon some of her harbors Great Britain has expended large sums—over $5,000,000 at Portland, over $6,500,000 at Holyhead, and over $7,000,000 at Plymouth. The figures may be much larger than these. I have not before me the expenditures for the more recent years. The great ship canal connecting Manchester with the sea at Liverpool, a distance of about 40 miles, was formally opened, amid great rejoicings, on the first of the present year, having been completed at a cost approximating $80,000,000.

France, with about three-fifths of our population and one-seventeenth of our territorial area, has expended since 1814 upon her harbors and waterways more than $650,000,000, in addition to $700,000,000 upon her railways. The aggregate length of her navigable rivers and canals is about 7,000 miles—not much exceeding the navigable length of the natural waterways in the single State of Louisiana.

Germany, in 1887, authorized the construction of more than 1,000 miles of new canal routes in addition to the 1,289 miles then in operation and her 4,925 miles of available navigable rivers.

Our method of making appropriations for river and harbor work has been faulty in the extreme. We have pursued a less wise course than have our European brothers; and a comparison of their methods with our own teaches a wholesome lesson and illustrates the only extravagant feature incident to the expenditure of our river and harbor appropriations. In Europe, when the improvement of a harbor or river is determined on, an estimate of the cost is made and a plan adopted. Then all the money necessary for the completion of the project is appropriated at once and made available for the regular, systematic, and continuous prosecution of the work.

With us, an order of survey of the stream or harbor proposed to be improved is made by Congress and this order is executed by the War Department, through the Engineer Corps. Inquiry is then made relative to the present and prospective commerce to be benefited by the contemplated improvement, with the view of determining what public necessity exists for the proposed expenditure and an opinion is required of the officer making the survey and of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War Department, through the Chief of Engineers, as to whether the locality is worthy of improvement or not. If worthy, a plan of improvement is formulated and estimates of the cost figured. All this is submitted in a detailed report to Congress. So far, so good. Then, if it be the judgment of Congress that the project is worthy and the improvement be entered on, the plan is formally adopted, and a small appropriation, frequently not more than 10, 15, or 30 per cent. of the estimate, is made *to begin* the work.

There is always uncertainty when the next appropriation to continue the work will be made, and how much it will be. Thus, the officer charged with the work of construction is compelled to limit his contracts to the amount actually appropriated. This is soon exhausted, and work is stopped until the period comes around for the passage of another river and harbor bill. For the last ten or twelve years such bills have been biennial, coming only once in two years. At the first, or long, session of each Congress it is possible to pass such measures; at the short session they are "filibustered" to death. Stoppage of the work for the want of funds, as above indicated, not only postpones the period when results will be realized by the completion of the work, but is wasteful in the last degree by deterioration of the work already done by being left in an incomplete condition, and by the plant and working force engaged upon it becoming scattered and removed.

Sometimes the results of one year's work are destroyed or become valueless from one cause or another before the next appropriation can be had. Sometimes the engineer, as a matter of economy or from force of circumstances, withholds the expenditure until more money is appropriated and becomes available for the work.

This slow, sporadic, intermittent, uncertain method of providing the means to carry on public works has operated greatly to our disadvantage. In many instances the final cost of securing desired results has been greatly increased over what would have been required had the estimated cost been made available at once. The fault of our system lies in not appropriating the amount needed to complete a public work when it is ordered to be commenced, or in not authorizing the making of contracts to complete it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The officers of the Engineer Corps protested from the beginning against the policy of partial appropriations, and the civil engineers of the country repeatedly called attention to the unwise action of Congress in this respect. Those of us in Congress who are intimately identified with this branch of public service saw and recognized this; but reforms are of slow growth, and it took years to educate popular sentiment in and out of Congress to the point of departure from the old, wasteful system, and the adoption of the new, or what is now called "the contract or continuous work," system.

This reform first made its appearance in 1890, on the river and harbor bill of that year. Its advent was retarded by the sharp criticism always encountered by river and harbor bills, and the fierce warfare waged on them in Congress.

It is true that prior to 1890—back in the seventies—a contract was awarded by law to James B. Eads to deepen the pass at the mouth of the Mississippi River. But that was an authorization to an individual to do specific work, and was not the outlining of a general policy, at that time, to be thereafter followed.

The contract provisions, however, in the bill of 1890 authorizing the Secretary of War to make contracts for the completion of certain public works was the first experimental step taken in the inauguration of a reform in legislation relating to river and harbor improvement, which may now be considered the settled policy of the government, to be prosecuted slowly, as the condition of the national Treasury admits, until all the works undertaken by the government, or at least the largest one, are included in it.

The bill of 1890 provided for contracts for completion in the case of five of the most important projects of river and harbor improvement. These were the St. Mary's Falls Canal, the Hay Lake Channel, and the harbors of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Galveston. Without increasing the usual appropriations for these projects, which the bill carried, the following proviso was inserted in the case of each:

"*Provided*, that such contracts as may be desirable may be entered into by the Secretary of War for the completion of the existing project, or any part of the same, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law."

This gave the Secretary of War the authority to contract ob-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ligations on the part of the government for the completion of the improvements at the localities mentioned, and gave to the works themselves the coveted status of being "expenditures authorized by existing law." Holding this status, the funds to meet the payments under the contracts became part of the current expenses of the government, and to be provided for as other expenses authorized by law are provided for, viz.: on one of the general appropriation bills, which come every year. The river and harbor bill is not one of the general appropriation bills, and, as already seen, comes only once in two years. Accordingly, the "contract" river and harbor projects passed out of the river and harbor bill and took their place on the sundry civil appropriation bill, which is one of the regular appropriation bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The result of this departure from the old system was extremely gratifying. Not only was no difficulty found in securing bids for work, to be paid for as appropriations might be made, but in letting the contracts for completion at the five localities alluded to a saving of millions of dollars was effected over previous estimates.

This change proved such a decided success in the matter of economy, as well as in insuring speedy results, that when the river and harbor bill of 1892 was being made up it was resolved to extend the system. Thirteen more of the largest and most important projects under way of improvement were, in that bill, placed under the "contract" or "continuous work" system. These were the harbor of Refuge at Point Judith, R. I.; the harbors of Charleston, Savannah, and Mobile; Humboldt Bay, California; the Hudson River, upper Mississippi River, lower Mississippi River, Missouri River, the Columbia River at the Cascades; the mouth of the St. John's River, the Great Kanawha River, and the Ship Channel, Great Lakes.

Under the authority thus given, the Secretary of War has entered into contracts for these works, with the most gratifying results as to economy and expedition of construction.

For instance, it was estimated that the Ship Channel in the Great Lakes would cost $3,340,000. Under the authority to let out the whole work, contracts have been made for the completion of the project for the sum total of only $1,304,434.38, much less than one-half of the original estimate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At Humboldt Bay, California, the estimate of the cost of the work was $1,715,115. A contract has been made to complete the project for less than half that sum, including contingencies.

At Hay Lake Channel, St. Mary's River, contracts have been made for the completion of the project at a saving of $900,000 under the estimate.

Great saving in money is also reported in the work on the Hudson River, on the Columbia River, on the lower Mississippi River, and at Mobile, at Charleston, at Baltimore, and other points; and as regards saving in time, the Chief of Engineers reports that "under the system of continuing contracts it is judged that the works will be completed in one-half the time which would be required were the works to depend on biennial appropriations and a consequent succession of contracts."

NEWTON C. BLANCHARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NAVAL UNION WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

A REPLY TO MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE.

BY MAJOR SIR G. S. CLARKE, K. C. M. G.

IT IS an inevitable tendency of our age to seek solace in dreams. The stress of life, with its feverish competition and its merciless facts, the breaking up of old faiths, the oppressive sense of an existence ruled by inexorable law, the increasing subordination of men and matter to mere machinery political or technical—such conditions force us into mental reaction, which finds various modes of expression. Fancy, hedged around by practicality and weighed down by hard figures, cannot be wholly stifled, and whether we linger over an anticipatory retrospect with Mr. Bellamy, indulge in "a look ahead" with Mr. Carnegie, or—far less profitably—attempt to peer across the "Borderland" with Mr. Stead, the same human craving supplies the impulse and explains the fascination. All round us lie problems whose solution would gild the destinies of millions unborn, and that solution sometimes appears very easy and natural. To teach to the age the mere conditions of the problem seems almost sufficient to secure the great object. What better form can our day-dreams assume than the portrayal of the ultimate and certain triumph? In dreamland there are no facts to encounter, no difficulties to surmount, and fancy ranging free can re-create the world or bend the minds of nations to the fulfilment of a noble aspiration.

Although Mr. Carnegie has claimed this freedom for his "dream" of the reunion of the Anglo-Saxon peoples,* his practical mind has unconsciously asserted itself. He anticipates difficulties, but makes light of them; he tempers imagination by reasoning, whereby the power of each is impaired. I fear that the effect of his implied appeal to the two nations is thus weak-

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, June, 1893.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ened. The cold thinker may be alienated by the play of fancy; the enthusiast by the display of reason. While cordially agreeing with aims which I have long held to be fraught with infinite good to the future of the world, I am doubtful whether Mr. Carnegie's dazzling article will materially advance those aims. I write, therefore, in no spirit of mere criticism, but with an earnest desire to find some practicable first step, acceptable to both nations, capable of being carried into immediate effect.

Historically, the data of the problem appear somewhat different to those on which Mr. Carnegie dwells. The question to-day is not that of "reunion." In the hundred and more years which have passed since the North American colonies fought for and achieved their independence, a great nation has arisen under conditions physical, social, and political, which differ widely from those of the original mother-country. Kinship remains, new ties are being daily formed; but the powerful factor of a vigorous distinctive nationality must not be ignored. We, too, have moved fast and far since 1776, building up an empire scattered over many lands, diffusing throughout the world the blessings of commerce, and broadening the bases of national liberty. The Britain of 1894 is not that ruled by George III. Thus we have to bring together in lasting union two great nations never yet united.

I do not care, therefore, to analyze, with Mr. Carnegie, the motives of the founders of the United States, or to deplore the means by which independence was attained. The past may lie buried; the present and the future may receive a new impress if we so will. This, at least, is certain. No legacy of bitterness on either side has come down to the present generation from the eighteenth century, and the great name of Washington, patriot, soldier, and statesman, is revered alike by both nations.* The wound caused by the wholly unlooked for and undesired separation of the mother from her child has long ceased to "bleed." Nor do I believe that any slighted feeling of soreness survives from the mistaken hostilities of 1812–14, to which, though they occurred within the memory of living men, Mr. Carnegie does not allude. The story is a painful one. Only the intense preoccupation of British statesmen under the strain of a great Euro-

* A short time ago an American township erected a memorial to a British officer who had served in the Imperial forces prior to the rupture. His very name, treasured through all these years by Americans, was forgotten in England.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pean struggle can explain the heedless drifting into a war the imminence of which was to the last disbelieved by the people of England, and which an Atlantic cable might probably have averted.* The story is now remembered in America only in connection with some naval successes and possibly in the pension list. In England, it has long been forgotten.

Thus I doubt the force, even the relevance, of the quotations from American and British statesmen between 1774 and 1779, to which Mr. Carnegie devotes one-fifth of his article. As regards the question of sentiment, it is surely best to dwell on utterances subsequent to 1814.

With true insight President John Q. Adams, in his second annual message, wrote as follows :

> The commercial intercourse between the two countries is greater in magnitude and amount than that between any two other nations on the globe. It is, for all purposes of benefit or advantage to both, as precious and in all probability far more extensive than if the parties were still constituent parts of one and the same nation. Treaties between such states, regulating the intercourse of peace between them and adjusting interests of such transcendent importance to both, which have been found in a long experience of years mutually advantageous, should not be lightly cancelled or discontinued.

So far had mutual understanding advanced within less than twelve years of a painful contest in which American trade had severely suffered. Four years later, in his first annual message, President Jackson penned these significant words :

> Everything in the condition and history of the two nations is calculated to inspire sentiments of mutual respect and to carry conviction to the minds of both that it is their policy to preserve the most cordial relations.

And after four more years he was able to add :

> It is gratifying to the friends of both to perceive that the intercourse between the two peoples is daily becoming more extensive, and that sentiments of mutual goodwill have grown up, befitting their common origin.

More than half a century has amply proved the foresight of President Jackson. Englishmen do not forget the words of Admiral Josiah Tatnall asserting the indissoluble bond of race at a moment of emergency. And on many subsequent occasions the navies of the two nations have shown a brotherhood infinitely more significant than the hysterical embracings at Toulon and

* The obnoxious Orders in Council were repealed five days before the declaration of war by President Madison, and practically the only question remaining was that of impressment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paris. In July, 1882, it was from the U. S. Flagship *Lancaster* alone that ready aid was forthcoming to restore order in the streets of Alexandria. The generous cheers of American seamen, themselves in mortal peril, when H. M. S. *Calliope* forced her slow way to safety in the teeth of the hurricane at Samoa, found a full echo in British hearts, and in Admiral Kimberley's simple words—"We could not have been gladder if it had been one of our own ships"—there lies a power transcending all the ephemeral efforts of expert diplomacy.

Viewing the question of national sentiment, therefore, from a slightly different standpoint to that of Mr. Carnegie, I fully agree with all he has eloquently written. The ties of race, of a common language and of a heroic history undivided till 1776, of a literature powerfully acting as an assimilator of thought,* of commerce and intercommunication yearly increasing, are steadily drawing the two peoples together.

If, from out of the past, any root of bitterness yet springs, it is to be sought in the events of 1860–5, to which also Mr. Carnegie does not refer. With nations as with individuals, an injury is more readily forgotten than the apparent absence of sympathy at a crisis of their lives. Americans, misled by a portion of the English press, may still believe that the real heart of my country was not with the cause of the Union, and may never have read the noble words of John Bright, who in truth spoke for the people. To the impressions of a great American, who well knew England, I appeal. Writing to his wife on August 7, 1861, John L. Motley exactly defines the situation:

> The *Times* has played the very devil with our international relations, and if there is one thing I have set my heart upon it is the *entente cordiale* between England and America.

And in another letter at this critical period, he generously adds:

> I battle stoutly for England and the English, for no one knows better than I all the noble qualities of that great nation, and how necessary it is to our own moral greatness and true prosperity to cultivate the closest relations with our ancient mother.

When the real history of British sentiment during the storm

* Since writing these words I have met with the following striking confirmation of their truth in one of Mr. Edmund C. Stedman's charming essays: "As to distinctions in form and spirit between the Old World literature and our own, I have always looked for these to enlarge with time. But, with the recent increase of travel and communication, each side of the Atlantic now more than ever seems to affect the other."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which shook, but, happily for the world, failed to wreck, the Union comes to be known, this one sore—if it then exists—will be healed forever.

Into dreamland, however, no traveller can lead another; our visions are our own. To me, mountains loom where Mr. Carnegie sees only the light mists of morning. They are not impassable; but the paths are not yet cleared and the way is long. In Mr. Carnegie's vision, the British empire, parcelled off apparently into separate States, is bodily incorporated with the Union, thus changing a form of government which has been the growth of centuries, abandoning at one stroke the position of a sovereign state held for nearly a thousand years, and claiming henceforth only a minority representation in a new national parliament which might vote away the old flag. It is all conceivable; the mutual benefits would be enormous; but, for us at least, it is a revolution such as the world has never seen, and even the great republic, which swallows with ease an Arizona or an Idaho, would reel under the shock. Yet—in dreamland—the accomplishment becomes "so easy a task that its very simplicity amazes and renders us incredulous."

I may not question the confident assertions that the republic is "ready" for this stupendous change, and is holding the door "wide open for the parent land to enter"; but present tendencies do not appear to point clearly to the "free entry of all British products" as an idea which "would be hailed with enthusiasm." Mr. Carnegie admits difficulties. Ireland and Canada are "ready"; Scotland and Wales need but "a short campaign of explanation"; Australia and South Africa, if not now ready, might perhaps be thrown overboard, for "there is really no longer any decided advantage to the parent land in colonies." There remains England, hampered by the incumbrances of her ancient monarchy, House of Lords, established church, and grave responsibility for India, all of which Mr. Carnegie's prophetic soul sweeps easily aside. Yet the monarchy is now endeared to the people as never before in all its long history. Under it, freedom has steadily advanced; by it, no national aspiration is thwarted. No throne in Europe rests upon a base so broad as that of Queen Victoria; no personality could equally appeal to the hearts of the masses at home, in India, and in the forty-eight colonies and dependencies of the empire. "The divinity which doth hedge a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

king" is capable of a modern interpretation, and there is no inherent incompatibility between a monarchy such as ours and democracy, which to the end of time will be more powerfully swayed by sentiment than abstract reason. Hereditary legislators and an established church may be doomed to speedy extinction, as Mr. Carnegie considers; but can he be certain that the monarchy will not long survive both?

As regards India, his views seem even less convincing and his fancy more rampant. The abandonment of the responsibilities of India is made almost a *sine qua non* to entry by the "wide open" door, for "no branch of the race now clear of any share of these would willingly consent to become a partner in them." Nevertheless, India "can soon be placed upon the road to independence and the British-American Union would guide it to this as well as the present union of the United Kingdom." In this guidance, however, lies the whole responsibility, which is thus repudiated in one sentence and accepted in another. The time may come when the heterogeneous races, which successive waves of conquest have spread over the vast peninsula, will be so far amalgamated as to be able to form a strong and stable government. But in the unchanging East the pace is slow, and hundreds of years may be needed for the transformation. Until that time arrives, peace, law, order, and defence against external aggression can be maintained only by Great Britain. No Eastern race, except the Japanese, has as yet approached within measurable distance of self-government, in the modern sense.

Our task in India is one which no other people has ever yet accomplished, and, heavy as is the responsibility, we shall not flinch from it. In Mr. Carnegie's view, the question of India and the colonies is merely one of commercial profit or loss. "Britain retains the trade of these regions because she can best supply their wants, and this she could do just as well if they were independent." The lives of nations, however, are not as yet ruled wholly by balance sheets, and the influence of Greater Britain has a value which cannot be expressed in pounds sterling. To India especially, as a training-ground, political, administrative, and military, we owe an important part of our national education. The very gravity of the responsibility is the measure of the moral gain.

While, therefore, the visionary portion of Mr. Carnegie's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

article—accomplished union—is an entrancing prospect, the rational portion—the discussion of the means of attainment—sadly fails to satisfy. The admixture of cold reason has dulled his fairest fancy. Most wisely, Mr. Bellamy forebore to explain how his social revolution was brought about. The dream of an Anglo-American commonwealth, fascinating as it is, and promising unimaginable good to the world, fades away, under Mr. Carnegie's treatment, into the dim mists of the far future. It is all possible, but the realization seems hopelessly remote, and meanwhile the present has pressing needs. Can no immediate step be taken toward a practicable union? Must all wait till the British monarchy has passed away and India is self-governed? If the ideal is now unattainable, need an approximation be postponed?

The "federal idea," on which the marvellous prosperity of the United States is based, has never yet been applied to territories geographically distinct. Switzerland, alone among other countries, has a constitution so framed. Democracy, even though "triumphant," works out its salvation in various ways, and that the conception of federal government has made little progress in England, the copious Home Rule debates amply prove. The great principle—that the State is the unit, controlling its own affairs, and subject to the central authority only in regard to external relations or matters in which all States are concerned—may be capable of a far wider interpretation than it has yet received. A union of two nations, each retaining its accustomed form of government and its separate finance, would not directly violate the principle.

The history of Europe shows the futility of mere alliances. Groupings of nations have followed each other with the haphazard variety of kaleidoscopic combinations. All have failed absolutely to secure permanent results; few have survived the strain of war. The explanation is simple. These alliances never had an enduring basis. They were artificially devised to meet temporary requirements—often to subserve the veiled ambitions of only one of the contracting parties. They have been largely the work of individual sovereigns or of professional diplomatists seeking solely their own ends. They have frequently followed the dictates of dynastic relationship, and ignored national antipathies. There was thus no guarantee of a lasting community of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests, and the revelation of divergency entailed swift disruption and a fresh grouping.

While past and present alliances have thus failed to fulfil the conditions necessary to permanence, the United States and Great Britain, alone of nations, satisfy every requirement of a true union. Their instincts and aptitudes, derived from a common ancestry, are essentially commercial, and it is not by mere accident that, as regards sea-borne commerce, they stand at the head of the world to-day. The approximate figures for 1891 are:

	Pounds sterling.
British empire	970,300,000
United States	357,700,000
France	300,200,000
Germany	212,000,000

Their mutual interests enormously exceed those of any other two nations, the total British trade with the United States in 1891 being over £168,000,000. Thus nearly one-half of the whole foreign trade of the latter is with the British empire.

The interesting figures given in President Cleveland's recent message illustrate this community of material interest in another aspect. During the year ending June 30th, 1893, of a total United States export of agricultural products amounting to $615,000,000, no less than 75 per cent. was taken by Great Britain. In the previous year the enormous total of $800,000,000 was reached, of which 78 per cent. found its way to the ports of the old country. Upon this vast trade the welfare of agriculture, which acts and reacts upon the whole fabric of national prosperity, must mainly depend. If it were interrupted or destroyed, the effects would be felt throughout the length and breadth of the North American continent. There is no possible alternative customer for $461,250,000 worth of farm produce.

The corresponding importance of the United States as a market for the products of British industry has been well pointed out by Mr. Carnegie; but the involved complexity of business relations, brought about by the free transference of capital from one country to the other defies all estimate. Only disaster to either, which must never come, would reveal the full extent of our mutual interdependence.

Can there be any doubt that the supreme interest of the two nations at this moment is that the ocean routes of the world should be inviolate and inviolable, or that this interest will in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crease with the years? Is there not here a basis for a union which will endure? So intimate are the commercial ties that, *mutatis mutandis*, an American might almost adopt the striking words of Mr. Deakin spoken at the Colonial Conference of 1887:

> "We cannot imagine any description of circumstances by which Great Britain should be humiliated or weakened, or her power lessened, under which the United States would not be humiliated, weakened, and lessened. And we are unable to conceive any circumstances under which the wealth and status of Great Britain could be increased, which would not increase in the same degree the wealth and status of the United States."

For any material loss to either nation would inexorably react upon the other, and by any humiliation the pride of the whole race would be touched. Such conditions are unique. In the whole history of the world they find no parallel.

While, therefore, both nations require for their prosperity that the rich trade in which they have a joint interest should pass secure across the seas, neither has any real motive for attacking the commerce of another power. Aggressive rivalry such as existed between Great Britain and Spain, Holland and France, has ended—on our part. So wide reaching are now the operations of capital that few merchant vessels could be captured or destroyed without injury direct or indirect to some British or American interest. Although our newspapers periodically announce, with heedless ostentation, the launch of a new "commerce destroyer," neither nation has any real inducement to employ such vessels for this baneful purpose, even if the dictates of humanity and the claims of our boasted civilization are set aside. The rôle of the commerce destroyer is at best cowardly and ignoble to the last degree, and, except when practised by a strong naval power against a weak one, can rarely result even in pecuniary profit. What advantage to the cause or the coffers of the Confederate States accrued from the many helpless ships burned by the *Alabama* and her consorts? Only on the principle of doing the utmost injury to an enemy with a view to hasten the issue of war, can commerce destroying be justified; and neither the United States nor Great Britain can see in the commerce of other peoples an incentive to attack. This again singles out the kindred nations from the ranks of the great powers, leads them towards union, and places them on the side of the weaker peoples, who merely desire to trade in peace. As regards com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merce, our common policy is strictly defensive. For us, it is surely best that the trade of the world should go free under whatever flag.

The security of commerce depends absolutely upon sea power, as Captain A. T. Mahan has brilliantly demonstrated; and the lesson has been taken to heart by both nations, which had, perhaps, forgotten the plain teaching of their history. For each, naval strength is essential. "To secure respect to a neutral flag," wrote Washington,* "requires a naval force organized and ready to vindicate it from insult or aggression. *This may prevent even the necessity of going to war.* . . . These considerations invite the United States to look to the means, and to set about the gradual creation of a navy." "A naval power," wrote President John Adams, "next to the militia, is the natural defence of the United States." And nearly one hundred years later President Cleveland has re-echoed these sentiments—"I am distinctly in favor," he says, "of building up a thorough and efficient navy." Independently, therefore, of all questions of union, each nation must grasp and retain sea power, for the fostering and the active exercise of which both their geographical positions and their natural genius are supremely adapted.

Mr. Carnegie claims for his "reunion" that it "would dominate the world and banish from the earth its greatest stain," that no power need any longer "maintain either a great standing army or a navy," for "there would be no use in maintaining large forces when the Anglo-American had determined that no one should attack." I am not sure that militarism would thus receive its death blow, or that war on land would be averted. Only a dominant military power could have intervened with decisive effect between France and Germany in July, 1870, and such it is happily improbable that either the United States or Great Britain will ever become. On the other hand, the union of the two nations in a naval league could in truth dictate, at will, peace throughout the sea highways of the world. Such a league we alone of all peoples could create and maintain. Wanting nothing at the expense of other powers, honestly desirous that the trade of all alike should go free, we alone could unite our naval strength with the certainty that no nation which did not harbor sinister designs would resent the fusion.

* Eighth Annual Address, 7th December, 1796.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Past combinations of naval forces have never been able to exert power proportionate to their numerical strength. Want of full harmony and of mutual understanding, the decadence of one of the allied navies, or geographical disabilities, serve to explain the comparative weakness manifested. A naval league between the United States and Great Britain would be powerful far beyond the mere roll of their fighting-ships. Sentiment and the deep mutual confidenee which kinship inspires would confer on this unparalleled union an irresistible moral strength, to which the position and the territorial isolation of naval bases would lend supreme strategical advantage. Again, no two nations have ever yet been fully organized in peace, with a view to joint action. Their combinations have been fortuitous and unprepared, their operations enfeebled by jealousy or distrust. The Anglo-American league of peace would exclude any such source of weakness. Scattered all over the world are British harbors, ready to become resting, coaling, and refitting stations for United States ships. The Navy Department and the Admiralty would be brought into close communication; the two intelligence departments would exchange information. The distribution of ships in given contingencies would be the subject of joint consideration. A free interchange of ideas as to construction and armament would prevail. Finally, the basis of the league would be essentially democratic; since the welfare of the masses is intimately bound up with the security of sea-borne trade, even though neither democracy has yet fully grasped the fact.

The advocates of union, in any form, have to meet two objections—one on either side—arising out of the past and both equally unreal. "They," wrote Washington, "by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice." These words are deeply graven on the heart of the American nation, and might inspire reluctance to enter into closer relations even with the "ancient mother." Mr. Carnegie anticipates and disposes of this difficulty. "The doctrine of non-intervention is strong enough even to-day to give her (Britain) practical immunity from participation in European wars." The old order has indeed changed since the illustrious first President penned his farewell address. Non-intervention is unquestionably the strong sentiment of the British nation to-day; and if any backsliding were possible, it would be checked by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growing influence of the great colonies. That no European alliance would now find favor is amply proved by present abstention. The blandishments of the central powers have been sufficiently employed. We have been in turn flattered, cajoled, and bidden to fear; but all in vain. So much do we owe to a democracy, which would nevertheless welcome a naval league with the United States with enthusiasm.

Meanwhile a policy of abstention from the responsibilities of a great nation has become impossible to the American people. It is even incompatible with the effective maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. Samoa must have taught its lesson. If ultra-continental possessions have so far been eschewed, the time of their necessity must soon arrive. Whatever may be the temporary settlement of Hawaii, that important outpost of the North Pacific must become American soil, and Captain Mahan has clearly indicated another part of the world where annexation will soon be needed. With the Nicaragua Canal, which American enterprise will certainly complete, must open a new era of responsibility, as President Cleveland evidently recognizes, while South America reveals a vista too extensive to portray. If, therefore, the assumption by the United States of its rightful position among the nations is inevitable, no first step could be so wise, so safe, or so natural as a naval league of armed neutrality with Great Britain. No guarantee of peace on the seas could be comparably effective. No other policy could open out to the American Navy such a noble prospect of world-wide beneficence.

The difficulty—if such it is—on our side arises merely from ignorance and traditions, rapidly disappearing. Diplomatic usages and habits of thought handed down for centuries easily become stereotyped. Our Foreign Office does not yet recognize in the United States the nation whose mere friendly neutrality would be of more value than the active alliance of any other power—the one people with whom alliance in any form is possible in the present temper of Britons at home and in the colonies. The swift uprising of the American nation and the prevailing European tendency to measure national strength solely by battalions account for the obscuration of the unimaginative official mind. Knowledge will soon triumph, as the recent creation of an embassy at Washington serves to prove; and once a true sense of scale is attained, this solitary British difficulty will disappear.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although the complete political union on which Mr. Carnegie's fancy dwells seems too remote to appeal to the practical mind of either nation, one other important first step suggests itself. We have long grown accustomed to arbitration as the only intelligent method of laying to rest our small disputes; we have not as yet resorted to free discussion as its most natural form. There is a certain indignity involved in admitting the foreigner to intervention in our family affairs. We knew each other as he knows neither, and an Anglo-American council could effectively deal with most questions likely to arise. Four members on either side, including the respective highest legal authorities, a president appointed for five years from each nation alternately, continuous renewal of members on the principle of the United States Senate, and complete dissociation from party politics are the necessary conditions of the constitution of a high tribunal which would command universal confidence. To such a body, meeting once a year, would be referred, by joint consent, all questions not necessarily controversial, but of mutual arrangement; and the misunderstandings which the interchange of diplomatic notes inevitably promotes, together with the friction on the manufacture of which some newspapers thrive, would cease. In the last resort arbitration would still be available. The substitution of personal conference for smart despatch-writing would mark an era in the relations of the two nations.

If I have seemed to question the fervid faith which breathes in the pages of "A Look Ahead," it is only in the earnest desire to further its full ultimate accomplishment. My dream does not range beyond the needs of the present. In the forefront of civilization are two nations, but only one race. Splendid possibilities of progress and of benefit to mankind are lost or impaired by the want of a union of means to a common purpose. The race fails, by the separation of its members, to exert the paramount influence for good which lies within its easy grasp. Putting aside all interference with established institutions, I firmly believe that a real federation, in the higher sense, may be attained. Then, as the twin stars brought hope to the mariner of old, so will the glorious flags of America and Great Britain promise abiding peace throughout the oceans and seas of the world.

G. S. CLARKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CONFERENCE OF NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS.

BY THE HON. F. T. GREENHALGE, GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS.

SOME time ago it was intimated by me that an informal, business-like conference of New England governors should be held to consider what steps were expedient or necessary for the preservation and advancement of the interests of all New England. The suggestion thus put forward had not been reduced to shape or proportion, nor were the limits, scope, and purpose of the scheme at all distinctly defined. As neither time nor opportunity has been given for the present realization of this project, it may not be out of place to answer the inquiry as to what purpose and advantage would be subserved by such a proceeding as that suggested.

I shall therefore, as plainly and concisely as possible, state what there was in the proposition as it presented itself in its somewhat crude and undefined form. At the outset I may say that it seems difficult to imagine what possible objection within any sort of reasonable limit could be offered to this suggestion, allowing always for the usual mild alarm which is excited by any novel idea in the minds of the "Forcible Feebles" of newspaper or political circles. To such minds the mere suggestion of such a conference brings up fantastic visions of evil portent. They imagine they see the mysterious John Henry, of Montreal, who during the long embargo attempted to create a feeling of disloyalty in New England towards the Union; the gloomy and sinister figure of Aaron Burr, with his schemes of personal empire, his dark conspiracies, his implacable revenges, rises in all the vast and terrible proportions of Milton's Satan; and inevitably and as a matter of course, the Hartford Convention, the stock *bête noir* of Democratic imagination, again assembles the members of its "infernal court" which, according to ancient Republican nursery tales, was plotting to erect the "Kingdom of New England"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a monarch chosen after the most approved *opera-bouffe* principles.

It may be that comments like those referred to are in the nature of *persiflage* and are not meant to be taken seriously, and it is true that the jests emanating from the class of minds alluded to are so often clothed with solemnity and their serious thoughts so often attired in farcical garb that it becomes difficult to decide what the true intent of the authors is, or whether they have any intent at all. But in answer to all questions and comments which may appear to be worthy of serious consideration, I present the following suggestions relative to the propriety and expediency of a business-like, informal conference of New England governors.

This is the day of organization, of united, collective action, in every line and branch of human industry, effort, action, and thought. The world is learning every day the value and efficiency of union, of consolidation, of the marshalling and massing of forces, for the attainment of any given object, for the preservation of any right or advantage. We have organization, united action, in every direction. Everywhere we find organization in business of capital, manifested in trusts, syndicates, corporations, pools, combinations, many of them beneficial, and many oppressive and illegal; organizations of labor, forming all kinds of combinations under all sorts of names, trades-unions, knights, brotherhoods, orders, federations, leagues, lodges, guilds, fraternities. "The butcher, the baker, the candle-stick maker," the doctor, the lawyer, the plumber, the railroad man, the grocer, the soldier, the sailor—all of them, rich and poor, great and small, appear to have decided to "get together," and to move, not independently and individually, but in masses, by hundreds and thousands, and in very much larger numbers. We have also an infinite variety and number of social and political, as well as business, organizations. City solicitors, bar associations, county commissioners, mayors and ex-mayors, *alumni* and *alumnæ* of school, college, and academy, boards of trade of city, county, and State, agricultural societies of county, State, New England, and the United States.

The conference and convention are then the ordinary and natural implements employed by the civilization of to-day. It is far more ordinary and natural to employ them than not to employ them. If the mayors of Massachusetts' cities were to hold a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conference, in such a time as the present, to discuss methods of relief; of furnishing employment; of dealing with pauperism and crime; of the best system of lighting the streets, or of conveying away the sewerage; of meeting pestilence or diminishing taxes—it would probably be admitted that little harm and much good might result. As a conference of mayors might be productive of beneficial results, it would seem as if a conference of governors need not be fraught with peril or evil consequences. As the next larger circle beyond the town or city is the county, and the next beyond that the commonwealth, so by natural and regular gradation or expansion the town or city organization widens into the county organization, and this last becomes in its turn a constituent part of the State organization; and the widest and fullest development of any organization in any of the six New England States is found in New England itself, which has all the elements of oneness contributed by climate, history, and situation, by affinities, habits, pursuits, and interests. And so potent have these factors of unity been that from the beginning the States of New England, both as originally constituted and as existing now, have, in a great majority of cases, acted as a unit, political, industrial, or otherwise.

In the early days of the Republic, when interest and sentiment were in an inchoate, if not chaotic, state, the instinct of self-preservation prompted the most jealous watchfulness on the part of one section, or one locality, toward another and every other. The early struggle to maintain and preserve the Union from the time of the adoption of the Constitution to the year 1812 was as heroic as the struggle for Independence or the war for the preservation of the Union. The war of 1812, even though it brought out at times warm sectional feeling, finally cemented and secured the Union. But the men of New England, and particularly of Massachusetts, were constantly on the alert to detect and resist any hostile combination or any effort to diminish their influence or prestige in the Union. Their territory was small, and geographically or politically more segregrated from the bulk of the national territory than any other portion. For a long period, the people had lived, as Palfrey says, "in remarkable seclusion from other communities." They were wonderfully homogeneous, and of high and, what is more, of equal, social grade, and the whole community was marked by uniformity of charac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter and purpose, which made New England the great force in the establishment of the United States and in its subsequent career. The people were accustomed to act together from the first. In 1643 the four colonies of Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven formed a league called "The United Colonies of New England." These little States contained thirty-nine towns and 24,000 people; and the union, rude as it was, proved of great value in the Indian wars which were soon to follow.

In 1773 Massachusetts, representing New England, came into close political sympathy with Virginia; and New England and Virginia led the way to the triumph of liberty and independence in 1783. After the formation of the Union the "balance of power" was to be preserved. Everything in the situation had been carefully weighed and measured, before the Union was consummated: population, territorial area, geographical situation, wealth, and opportunities for future development. The purchase of Louisiana in 1804 occasioned much distrust and complaint on the part of New England. Already the united South had attained an influence in the national councils fraught with danger to New England. There were 840,000 slaves in the South, and fifteen votes were given to that section on account of this part of the population. Even then the so-called "negro vote" (which was *not* a negro vote) had been sufficient to secure legislation injurious to New England, and had practically determined the Presidential election of 1801. Massachusetts went so far as to propose an amendment to the Constitution to correct this system of representation, but it was not adopted. In 1808, while the "long embargo" was still in force, and the "Force Act" was exciting indignation and resistance throughout New England, a call for a convention of the New England States was formally issued. It was the firm stand of New England at this time which contributed largely to the passage of the act lifting the embargo, which act was signed by Jefferson March 1, 1809.

The Hartford Convention was held in December, 1814; but as the war soon terminated, and the rights of New England did not suffer in the settlement, the proceedings of that convention proved to be of no lasting importance, except in the minds of strong political partisans, who invest the doings and purposes of that body with a significance and complexion not borne out by evidence or history.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And so from time to time the action and influence of New England have been exerted for the preservation of her rights and interests, and without injury or menace to any other portion of the country. The conference at Altoona in 1862 was a notable instance. To-day New England is practically a unit—political, social, and industrial—but her interests are those of the country at large; she is at the head of the procession, not in the way of it. New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, and all the industrial States of the Union are in full sympathy with New England to-day upon all the great political and economic questions at issue, and they will welcome her leadership in these matters instead of disputing it.

It is apparent, then, that throughout her history New England has been a powerful factor in national affairs, and in the protection of her rights and interests by acting as a unit; that New England is the natural, convenient, and effective consolidation of the interests and purposes of the several states within her limits; that by reason of her enlightenment, her experience, her devotion to the best interests of the whole country, her success in business, in industry and in commerce, her educational and charitable institutions, in short by reason of everything which tends to develop, to strengthen, to adorn a state and to promote the happiness and prosperity of the citizen, New England is entitled to the respect and consideration of other states and sections of the country.

But there are dangerous influences and tendencies at work to-day which bode no good to the country. The conservative influences and tendencies of New England should be expressed in every reasonable and intelligent manner. When Caliban rises to threaten the country with crude and reckless theories of business and finance, it is time that the beneficent powers of Prospero should be brought into play. New England has two claims entitling her to be heard: she is most deeply interested in good money and good business; and she has had more experience and presumably has more knowledge in these things than the people of any other equal area in the United States. As regards all the prejudice which may seem to exist against her in some quarters of the country, the depth or sincerity of this prejudice may fairly be suspected because it is contradicted by many honest and genuine tributes of respect which are unmistakably offered to her by imitation of her institutions, her customs, and her methods. As

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for Massachusetts, she enjoys the loyal respect and love of her sister-states of New England to a most remarkable and gratifying degree. There is a warm sisterly feeling among the states of New England and not the slightest symptom of envy, jealousy, or uncharitableness, from one to another, so far as my personal observation or information goes.

The questions of raising a revenue or of preserving a correct money standard are not the only questions before the people, though they may be of the first magnitude. There are other important problems which are to be considered and solved. Uniformity in many lines of legislation is important—uniformity in industrial conditions as affected by legislation, in railroad management, in sanitary regulations, in marriage and divorce, in the laws relating to wills, deeds, etc., in the laws relating to elections, to civil and criminal jurisdiction or administration, and in many other matters.

There happen to be six Republican governors in New England at present. This has not always been the case ; and as Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut have sometimes chosen governors of other political parties, the unanimity of sentiment manifested by the present state of things might serve to promote an important object of the proposed conference, which was to impress the members of the national legislature with the wide-spread opposition to radical legislation in financial or industrial affairs.

In 1890 the population of New England was 4,700,745. The value of its manufactures in 1880 was $1,106,158,303, and the total value of manufactures in the United States was $5,369,579,-191, from which it will be seen that New England produced more than one-fifth of the entire value of the product of the whole country. The great State of New York, with a population of 5,981,934 (an excess of 1,281,389 over that of New England) has manufactures to the value of $1,080,696,596, or about $26,000 less than the total value of manufactures in New England. It will be seen, therefore, that New England is as deeply interested in industrial matters or in legislation bearing upon industrial interests as any equal area of territory in the country.

A conference of the chief magistrates of these New England States, a comparison of rules and methods, a discussion of popular and legislative tendencies, of popular and legislative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

needs or desires, of executive and legislative business and the methods of performing it, might and ought to be as productive of beneficial results as similar conferences of business, political, or social organizations, and it is possible that in critical times the united efforts or influence of the governors of New England might suffice to turn the scale of political or industrial action.

F. T. GREENHALGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

FRANCE AND THE INCOME TAX.

THE question of an income tax is to the fore just now not in the United States only, for it is an exceedingly "live topic" in France also. It was an important plank in the Radical and Socialist platforms during the elections last summer for members of the Chamber of Deputies, and the conflicting views on this subject held by the different ministers of the Dupuy cabinet was the main cause of the parliamentary *coup-de-théâtre* which overturned that cabinet, and set up in December last the present Casimir-Périer ministry. And in his Declaration read before the Chamber and Senate, even the new President of the Council did not turn his back on the advocates of an income tax, since, in proposing changes in the French fiscal system, so much in need of reform, he expressed the hope that an impost might be levied by which "acquired wealth would be particularly reached."

An income tax of a certain kind, much resembling that which prevails in England, has not been unknown in France in the past, and is not unknown there to-day, though the spirit of the French *fisc* has, at least since the great Revolution, been always adverse to an income tax such as we have known in the United States.

As far back as 1296 the publican turned towards the income, and the taxpayer was required to take an oath on the Bible that his declaration was truthful. A similar impost was voted by the States General as early as 1355, and was reimposed at subsequent meetings of that body in succeeding years. After the wars of the Fronde, in the middle of the seventeenth century, the finances of the kingdom had fallen into such a lamentable condition that the king, in despair, looked for help in an income tax. One of the clauses of the proposed measure declared that all subjects who should make a false declaration would have their property confiscated. But the Duke of Orleans considered the project impracticable and it was abandoned. In 1710, however, a tax of this kind was imposed and collected, a quarter of the income being grasped by the state; and, as if foreseeing the advent, eighty years later, of the levelling spirit of the Revolution, nobles, clergy, and people were placed, by the royal decree which established this tax, on the same footing. But this action caused violent protests in the two first-named classes, which were carried to such excesses that St. Simon refers to the dispute as "a bloody affair." This tax was continued for several years. Under the old *regime*, however, the higher orders generally succeeded in pushing off the burdens of taxation on to the burgers and people, which is, doubtless, one of the hidden causes why modern France has never taken kindly to an income tax of the orthodox stamp.

M. Leroy-Beaulieu, one of the leading French political economists, says in his "*Traité de la Science des Finances*," when he speaks of the income tax:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The difficulties in the way of its establishment are very great. They spring in part from our democratic conditions, political divisions, and administrative instability. Such a tax is more dangerous in a republic, where there is a tendency for government to fall into the hands of the working classes and their representatives, than in a monarchy, whether it be absolute or limited."

The reflection made in the last sentence is as applicable to the United States as to France, and explains why the French Conservatives of the past and the moderate Republicans of to-day hesitate to enter upon a line of legislation advocated by the "representatives" of "the working classes," as M. Leroy-Beaulieu well describes, without intending it, the Radical and Socialist Deputies of the present hour.

There is a strong strain of sentimentality running through French politics even to-day, and it was rampant in 1789. It shows itself especially in fiscal legislation. Thus, in the celebrated *Address to the French on the Payment of Taxes*,* issued by the revolutionary fathers in 1791, the word "*contribution*," instead of the word "*impôt*" of the ancient *régime*, is used throughout the document, for, we are told, while subjects support imposts, only a free people offer contributions to the public treasury. And several paragraphs of the address are devoted to an enumeration and condemnation of the various ways in which the tax-gatherers of the king used to violate "that holy law of domiciliary liberty." This feeling has repeatedly shown itself whenever the establishment of an income tax has been proposed in France. At such times the average Frenchman is disposed to make much the same reply as this of the Englishman who was testifying before a committee of inquiry on the income tax: "To go and ask somebody, 'What is your income?' is not the rôle of a gentleman." So every time a deputy has suggested empowering the tax-gatherer to put an important question of this kind, the proposal has always been received with great disapprobation. In 1871 Casimir-Périer, father of the present Prime Minister, said, in his report in the name of the Budget Committee, that the minority was opposed to the measure because "it saw therein the germ of a system of inquisition into private affairs, war between capital and labor, and progressive taxation"—the very ends sought for by the French Radicals and Socialists who are now demanding the establishment of an income tax.

The history of France shows that propositions of this kind are generally brought forward at moments of crisis and political instability. During the Republic of 1848 two Ministers of Finance proposed such a tax, but the propositions did not become laws. That arch-socialist, Proudhon, who was a member of the Constituent Assembly at this period, urged that all incomes from real and personal property be taxed one-third. Its collection was to be left to the diligence of tenants and debtors. Of course such a bill stirred up a tumult, and when the excited legislators came to a vote, only Proudhon and a single other member held up their hands in favor of the project.

Two or three times during the Second Empire an income tax of some description was talked of, but never put into effect, and when the National Assembly met at Bordeaux, after the Franco-German war, this same tax was expected to pay off the enormous sums needed at that time. A score of

* This address will be found in the appendix to a volume published by Guillaumin & Co., Paris, entitled *L'Impôt sur la Revenu*, by M. Yves Guyot, formerly Minister of Public Works. The author is one of the ablest of living French public men in all matters of political and social economy, and this volume is a very clear and concise account of income-tax legislation in France and other countries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propositions of this nature were laid before the body during the next fifteen or twenty years, Gambetta even offering a panacea of this kind. The main purpose of them all was to exempt landed property, which, however, is well able to pay more, at the expense of personal property, and all were voted down. Every proposal to increase the land tax was also negatived. The upshot of all these debates was a slight augmentation of the tax on licenses, while an additional seven hundred millions of francs was secured by indirect taxation.

Another reason why a thoroughgoing income tax does not meet with much favor in France is due, perhaps, to the fact that an impost of this kind, resembling, at least, the one which prevails in England, does not differ materially from the four main French "direct contributions," which are a tax, not on any particular class of incomes, but on incomes in general. These consist of the land, house, and furniture tax, and the door and window tax. But the ratepayer is not subjected to an inquisitional declaration of any kind. All leases have to be registered, and as the rent one pays is a pretty safe guide as to the amount of one's income, this figure is taken as the basis for the tax list of a large portion of the inhabitants of France. It may be called an indirect income tax.

The fiscal battle in France has always been and is still waged between the advocates of direct and indirect taxation. Under the ancient *régime* the States General favored direct taxation. Sully and Colbert, however, preferred the indirect system, because the privileged classes could thus be reached. With the exception of Norway, France is of all modern European states the one where the proportion of indirect taxes is the largest. In the time of Francis I. (1515–1547) fifty per cent. of the taxes were of an indirect nature. At the end of the reign of Louis XI., in 1483, the figure had been twenty-two per cent. But under Louis XIV. (1643–1715) there were years when 175 to 100 was the proportion between indirect and direct taxes. In Necker's budget, presented on the eve of the French Revolution, the figures stood at about 115 to 100. The National Assembly had an antipathy for a system which it considered undemocratic, and the order of the figures was soon reversed, direct taxation furnishing the larger sum to the nation's treasury. In the budget of 1791 the indirect taxes formed sixty-six per cent. of the whole amount, and it soon fell to fifty-one per cent. Under the Consulate it rose to ninety per cent. During the Restoration the proportion of indirect to direct taxes was as 143 to 100, about the same as in the time of Colbert. During the reign of Louis Philippe the figure was 173; during the Second Republic 168, and the average during the Second Empire was as high as 225. To-day, for every franc of direct, a Frenchman pays six in indirect taxes. It was indirect taxation which furnished nearly all the money necessary to pay Germany the war indemnity of $1,600,000,000 in 1871.

Thiers was always an ardent supporter of indirect taxation. But, then, it was he who said that "political economy is a tiresome literature," and that "statistics is the art of being precise about what one knows nothing of." The late President Grévy, on the other hand, was opposed to this system, and as far back as 1849 voted against the re-establishment of the liquor tax, because he held that it was contrary to the principle of proportionality in matters of taxation. Thus have French statesmen long been divided on the merits and demerits of the two systems. But now that the republican form of government is firmly established in France and parties have the leisure to study economic questions more completely; now that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country is becoming more and more democratic, and the Socialists are securing such a strong foothold in the chamber, indirect taxation, which falls so heavily on the poor, must sooner or later give way to increased direct taxation. In fact M. Casimir-Périer speaks out plainly in this sense in the Declaration already mentioned, and M. Yves Guyot, in the work which has been cited shows clearly that such a reform can be introduced with perfect justice to all concerned, since landed property is not paying its share. In this way the Moderate Republicans hope to checkmate the Radicals and Socialists, and postpone to a still more distant future the threatened enactment of an income tax, which has become a party cry, not so much for the purpose of putting money in the national treasury, as for extracting money from the purses of the rich *bourgeoisie*.

THEODORE STANTON.

RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

THERE are many portions of this country where the free public library is still unknown, and where its value as an educational factor is not as yet appreciated. During the past few years, however, a new impetus has been given to the movement, so that to-day it may with truth be said that in its new life the free public library is passing through very much the same phases of its existence as did the free public school, which for many years received its sole support from a very small section of the country. The benefit to be derived from a collection of books open to the free use of the public is being more widely appreciated, and its introduction to localities to which it has heretofore been a stranger must necessarily follow. The intelligent teachers of the present day are among the strongest supporters of the free public library, having the opportunities to see the great advantages which the pupils under their charge enjoy in the free use of a library of well-selected books. The very best results in education will be found in that town where the librarian is enthusiastic in his efforts to supply the needs of the school superintendent in carrying out his desires of instilling in the minds of his pupils that habit of reading which tends to make their studies tenfold more beneficial. This coöperation between these two men charged with the education of the young results not only in forming a habit of reading, but in teaching a pupil to think and investigate for himself.

I am led to write these lines on the free public libraries by reason of the fact that after reading a paper on the subject last summer before an audience composed largely of teachers, I was surrounded by many who, coming from those sections where free public libraries are still institutions of the future, were greatly surprised to learn of the very important part which libraries are playing in educational life elsewhere. Their crude ideas of the use of a public library, as well as the duties of a librarian, find their best expression perhaps in the following extract from an address delivered by the late James Russell Lowell. He pictured to his hearers the inefficient, if not almost useless, librarian when he said: "Formerly the duty of a librarian was considered too much that of a watch dog to keep people as much as possible away from the books, and to hand these over to his successor as little worn by use as he could." Then follows a picture of the enthusiastic and progressive librarian of the present day, in these significant words: "Librarians now, it is pleasant to see, have a different notion of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their trust, and are in the habit of preparing for the direction of the inexperienced lists of such books as they think best worth reading." Herein lies the secret of very much of the excellent work now being done in our free public libraries. The librarian feels that he is negligent of his trust if he does not do something more than hand out to the inquiring reader such book as he may ask for. He deems it to be part of his duty not only to take the book to the reader, but also to draw the reader to the book. In short, his ambition is to see the books which are in his keeping put to good use, resting confident that such reading must of very necessity improve the mind of the reader, and to just that extent prove to be of lasting benefit to him.

But it may be asked, What can a librarian do? What steps can he take to be of service to the reader other than to furnish him with that literature for which he seeks? The answer to these questions must be "very little," if it is always left to the reader to take the initiative. If, on the other hand, the librarian studies the tastes of the frequenters of his library, experience in some of our cities at least teaches that the answer must perforce be "much."

As an illustration of one method from the use of which good results are sure to follow, it may be well to mention that work above referred to, namely, a coöperation between the school superintendent and the librarian. As fact is better than fancy, so, too, will the practice of a librarian in one of our large cities prove of greater interest than would any theory which might be described, The librarian of the city keeps himself continually informed as to the course of study being pursued by the students of the university situated near by. In the reading-room he sets aside a table for their especial use, on which will always be found those books which they may, from time to time, find it profitable to refer to in the course of preparing their themes and essays. A student having, for instance, a thesis to write on some historical subject, knows that he has only to go to the library to find on this special table such books as the librarian has selected as bearing particularly on the subject of his paper.

Another work which this same librarian is doing, whose good results are self evident, is to keep informed of those many topics of current news which are daily appearing in the newspapers. Of these he makes a list, which he places on a bulletin board, adding to each subject the names of those books or magazine articles with their catalogue number, which one may well read if he desires to pursue the subject. Let us assume that the librarian, on taking up the morning paper, reads that the United States Government has established a protectorate over the Hawaiian Islands. This item of news he cuts from the paper, places it on the bulletin board, and to it affixes the name of such books as he can recommend to the reader who desires to know more of the Hawaiian Islands, or who wishes to clear up his perhaps too crude ideas of what a protectorate is. How many of us when looking over our daily paper find ourselves but slightly informed on many topics we read about? To how many of us would not such a librarian as above described prove of great assistance? It is such work as this which induces the reader to investigate for himself, and it is such a library as this which, being something more than a mere storehouse for books, proves to be a pleasant retreat for the reader, and a delightful experience to the visitor.

The writer does not remember ever having seen in any library any sight

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which has given him more pleasure than when, one winter's morning, talking with the librarian of the above-mentioned library, he watched the visitors come in, both young and old, male as well as female, and, after consulting the bulletin of that day's news, go at once to the desk and ask for such books as referred to those subjects in which each was particularly interested. This surely is work worth doing, for it trains the reader in that very desirable habit of investigating for himself, and incidentally inculcates a love of reading which is sure to prove a lasting source of happiness and contentment.

Such, also, is the kind of coöperation which this same librarian has established between himself and the school teachers in his city. He urges these latter to bring the scholars to the library that they may there consult books and pictures having reference to their courses of study. The enthusiasm which such a man brings to his daily work makes not only the library a pleasant place to go to, but tends, in a very marked degree, to make the schoolroom happier and its daily task more beneficial. Of this city it cannot justly be said, as was charged by the Hon. Charles Francis Adams in speaking of a certain New England town, "that though the school and the library stand in our main street, side by side, there is, so to speak, no bridge leading from the one to the other."

In the city above referred to there is a steady stream constantly passing between the school and the library, and the good results of such investigation are best shown by the class of books which the pupils in its public schools are using. It is this energy of the modern librarian which has developed the newer life in library management of which mention has been made, and his continued enthusiasm must be depended upon to still further increase the usefulness of which free public libraries are capable. The good service which such a librarian can render to a community may, however, be very much hampered, if his library is under the charge of a board of trustees who have no true conception of the possibilities for usefulness of the institution under their charge. Too often does it happen that, unmindful of what is being done in other cities, they permit matters to drift along, regarding the ideas advanced by a librarian, such as above described, as foolish and impracticable. The problems of library science are as important as those which present themselves to school committees, and a trustee who, either from unwillingness, or from want of time, does not to some extent at least make a study of them, is a detriment to the community, because he is occupying a place which might be filled by some one who would meet the librarian's zeal with his own enthusiastic interest in the subject. Given a city or town with both a progressive librarian and an enthusiastic and investigating school superintendent, their respective boards being in hearty sympathy with them, and there is practically no limit to the good educational work which their combined efforts will accomplish. The school, teaching how to read, and the library, teaching what to read, will together raise the standard of the literature read in that city, which result must show fruit in the increased happiness and intelligence of its inhabitants.

E. C. Hovey.

LABOR POLITICS IN A NEW PLACE.

Since the Reform Act of 1884, Labor candidates at parliamentary elections in England have been numerous. There were three Labor members in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the House of Commons in the period which intervened between the reform acts of 1867 and 1884. The first of these acts enfranchised the working classes in the boroughs; the second enfranchised those in the rural communities; but it was not until after the last of the measures of parliamentary reform that Labor candidates came forward in any large numbers at the general elections. They appeared in considerable numbers at the election of 1885; a larger number came forward in 1886, at the election which followed the rejection of the last Home Rule bill; and in 1892 the number was again greatly increased, with the result that in the present House of Commons there are sixteen or seventeen Labor members, representatives of both the old and the new trade-unionism.

Until about two years ago, Labor candidates had sought election only to the House of Commons. Within the last two years, however, they have sought seats on the town councils, on the school boards, and on the boards of guardians for the relief of the poor. These are separate and distinct local bodies, elected at different times, but practically on the same franchise, and on a franchise under which all householders, whether men or women, have votes. As is the case with membership of the House of Commons, no pay attaches to membership of any of these local administrative bodies, although service on them entails large calls on the time of members.

All the city and town councils in England are fashioned on the same model, that set up by the Municipal Reform Act of 1835, and in the month of November each year in every municipality in the country, at least one-third of the members of the town council are elected. The municipal elections in 1892 followed too closely upon the general election to admit of the success of the Labor candidates in the Parliamentary contests having its full effect upon the new movement in municipal politics; but the quickening effect of that success was apparent at the elections in the municipalities in November, 1893.

The Labor movement in national politics in 1892 was strongest in the north of England, in the mining constituencies of Lancashire and Yorkshire and of Durham and Northumberland, and it was in these counties that the introduction of Labor politics into municipal affairs was everywhere apparent in the November elections. Nine Labor candidates were put forward in Manchester, five or six in Salford, several in each of the boroughs of Leeds, Bradford, and Halifax, and, in fact, there was scarcely a large municipality in the industrial districts of the north of England in which one or more Labor candidates did not seek election to the town council. In some places these candidates came out as Socialists, in others as the representatives of the Independent Labor movement, and wherever a Labor candidate was nominated little heed was paid to the old party lines, the representatives of Labor being put forward in opposition to both Liberal and Conservative candidates.

Imperial politics have absolutely nothing to do with the duties which Parliament has imposed on town councils. All these bodies are merely administrative, and each is held in check by the Local Government Board in London. Notwithstanding this fact, in many of the English municipalities the members of the councils are elected on party lines; and these lines are as well drawn at the annual town elections in November as at the Parliamentary elections. At the municipal elections the Liberals have always claimed the support of the working classes. Hitherto they have generally received it, but it now seems to be the policy of the local leaders of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more aggressive section of the new democracy to nominate candidates of their own class and to put forward demands in behalf of labor in municipal as well as in national politics.

As yet these demands have not been embodied in a programme which is accepted by the Labor party in all the municipalities. The municipal Labor programme is not so well defined as is the Newcastle programme of the Radicals, the Fabian programme, or the programme of the Independent Labor party in national politics. It is, however, gradually defining itself, and the shape the Labor programme will ultimately take may be ascertained with some exactness from a perusal of the speeches which were made in the municipalities at the November elections. From these it is easy to note the points on which the Labor party is disposed to make new departures in municipal government.

To begin with, the prevailing idea with the Labor party in municipal politics appears to be that the employers and the moneyed classes have hitherto enjoyed more than their fair share of the management of town affairs. In a measure this is true, for the municipal candidates of both the old political parties have always been drawn exclusively from the middle classes. In order to bring about some equalization, the Labor party is demanding the abolition of the aldermanic bench in the city councils. Aldermen owe their presence in the existing municipal system to the action of the House of Lords when the Municipal Reform bill was before it in 1835. The aldermanic principle was introduced with the intention of safeguarding property, and by its working one-fourth of the members of every city council are elected by the council itself, and not by the direct vote of the townspeople. The Radicals long ago objected to the aldermanic principle, but of late they have ceased to agitate for its abolition, and the campaign which the Radicals began and continued for nearly half a century, has been taken up by the Labor party, which is now seeking so to amend the constitution of all governing bodies that every member shall owe his place to the direct votes of the constituents.

The Socialistic Labor party in the municipalities affirms that "it sees in the municipal machinery an important means by which it can work out the industrial emancipation which is at the bottom of its policy." But the Socialists and the Independent Labor party are in agreement in many of the demands they are making. Both ask for an eight-hours day for all servants of the municipalities, and for trade-union wages to all workmen engaged on public works. They are also in agreement in the demand that there shall be an end to the contractor and the middleman in work undertaken for or by the municipality. When a new drainage scheme is to be carried out or a bridge rebuilt, the Labor party insist that the work shall be done under the supervision of officers of the municipality and by workmen directly in its pay. They also insist that the same principle shall be adopted in all work paid for out of public money. A large municipality like Manchester or Liverpool, for instance, pays out thousands of pounds every year for the uniforms of its police force, its fire brigade, and its army of inspectors. Under the existing arrangement the city council invites bids from tailors for the furnishing of these uniforms, and usually accepts the lowest of the offers. The Labor party is anxious to put an end to this system of competition for municipal orders, and in its place calls for the establishment of municipal workshops and clothing factories in which trade-union rates of pay and conditions of work shall prevail, and requires that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in these workshops and factories, as in connection with all other public works, the municipality shall set an example to all other employers of labor.

The municipalization of the street-car lines is also demanded by the Socialists. In Manchester there was a protest against the extension of the large tenement-block system, and a demand for more self-contained cottages on the outskirts of the city, with the provision of better railroad and street-car facilities for reaching them. A kindred demand was that in every new dwelling-house the town council shall insist that there shall be a bathroom, no matter how small the house or the rental at which it is to be let. Other demands in Manchester and Salford were that gas should be sold at net cost, and that the coke produced at the municipal gasworks should, irrespective of the price of coal, be sold at prices placing it within the means of the poorer classes.

In almost every city where the Labor party took an active part in the November elections, there were protests against the salaries paid to the higher municipal officials, and demands for the levelling down of the salaries of the lawyers who hold the office of town clerk, and of the borough engineers and their assistants, and the levelling up of the wages of the unskilled day laborers employed by the municipality. These men receive wages which range from eighteen shillings to one pound a week. These wages are regarded as inadequate by the Labor politicians, who, on the other hand, maintain that the salaries paid the more responsible members of the permanent municipal staff are altogether too high. There are not a score of men, all told, in the service of the English municipalities who receive salaries of a thousand pounds a year; but the Labor politicians insist that no such salary should be paid, but that £250 a year should be the maximum salary for municipal officials, no matter what their qualifications or the responsibilities of the offices.

On one or two points there is a remarkable lack of agreement between the Labor politicians in the different municipalities: In Salford, for instance, the Labor leaders, especially those representing the older trade-unionism, objected to the maintenance of the Labor Bureau which the Town Council established in the winter of 1892, when the unemployed problem became pressing. Their complaint against the bureau was that it showed the needs of labor and enabled the employers to obtain men for less wages than would otherwise be paid. The same complaint, it may be noted, has been brought against the *Labor Gazette*, which has been published by the Board of Trade since Mr. Mundella extended the Labor Department at Whitehall. Almost at the same time that the Salford Labor leaders were putting forward their plea against the local labor bureau, the Labor leaders in Liverpool were urging the city council to follow the lead of Salford and establish a labor bureau, with a view to reducing the number of the unemployed.

Only a few of the demands put forward by the Labor party at the municipal elections can possibly be accepted by the town councils to which they were addressed, and to which the Labor party elected a fair number of their representatives. Largely increased Parliamentary powers will be necessary if many of these demands are to be conceded, and these new powers can only be obtained by a much further development of the Labor and Socialistic movement in national politics. This development, however, will be greatly aided by the organization and activity of the Labor party which were shown in the municipal elections in November.

EDWARD PORRITT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FINANCIAL DEPENDENCE OF WOMAN.

SOCIAL reformers are not slow to point out to women that the key of their position is financial independence; without it, the most intimate relationships rest on an insecure foundation. It is a matter of common observation that the married woman with means of her own has more chance of consideration than the dowerless woman; other things being equal, her opinion, her entity are more valuable when enhanced by a settled income of her own, even if it be small. The Women's Progressive Society has for its fifth object: "To educate public opinion on the necessity of financial independence of all women."

The fulfilment of such an aim is strictly in accord with the socialistic tendencies of our day, and much, indeed almost everything, can be said in its favor. Women are grasping the conditions which surround them; they perceive that, though certain men, imbued more or less with the chivalrous spirit, may grant a substantial equality to the women dependent on them, it is for them a much safer position to stand by their own exertions on the basis of equality. In the former case, women depend on what lies outside self; in the latter, on self alone. In certain circumstances the difference is practically non-existent; in others, it may be infinite.

At a recent meeting of progressive women, one of the speakers gave forth no uncertain sound on this subject. She stated that the financial independence of her sex is strictly necessary to happiness in marriage; that without it the married woman is little better than a slave; in one word, it is the *degradation of woman*. And this speech was much applauded by her hearers, of whom a large proportion were self-supporting women.

Now it may be granted that the ideal position for every able-bodied man or woman is a self-supporting one; the undoubtedly socialistic tendency of our age will develop this ideal. Every individual will more and more render service to society in return for benefits received; the elimination of parasites, of the vast army of do-nothings, is a foregone conclusion. It may be predicted with absolute certainty that the English legislature, when its constitution has become more democratic, and hereditary legislators have disappeared, will deal with the probate duty on vast fortunes, and with the land question, in a manner in which it has never dealt with them before. As yet, we have hardly touched the fringe of these difficulties.

But whilst admitting that individual independence is an ideal worth working towards, it will not be attained any sooner by progressive women representing the financial dependence of a wife as degradation. It is conceivable that if any considerable number of independent women acted on such an assumption, they might positively retard that independence they wish to achieve. It may be conceded that the financial independence of woman would in the main be a solid guarantee of her happiness in the marriage relation. It has been repeatedly pointed out by the intelligent foreigner, especially, perhaps, the Frenchman, that an Englishwoman begins marriage badly who is made over to her husband without a *dot*—a factor of such importance in France that, with exceptions, a woman is hardly considered marriageable unless she is provided for to some extent. The thriftlessness of English parents, their birdlike irresponsibility to their children—possibly an outcome of the rapid growth of England's empire—is bound to yield in this particular; changed conditions, the insight and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writings of men and women like Mr. Walter Besant,* Mrs. Annie Besant, and Charles Bradlaugh, will surely help to raise a standard for parents who have no moral right, either for the sake of a daughter or her husband, to send her dowerless to that husband. The recognition that respectable provision for his daughters is a father's duty will equally certainly tend to limit the family; the cases of men with twelve, ten, or even half a dozen unprovided daughters will, ere many years have passed, be reprobated as instances of gross injustice and unpardonable self-indulgence. But in the mean time little is to be gained by representing the financial dependence of a married woman on her husband as a species of degradation. If any considerable number of capable women, honorably supporting themselves, were to decline marriage because it entailed their withdrawal from self supporting employment, and consequent financial dependence on their husbands, the cause of advanced womanhood could not but receive a check, if there be any truth underlying the doctrine of heredity. From the point of view of "forward light brigade," their ranks must be recruited again and again in the coming generation by women who object to this financial dependence. To leave marriage to the twining-ivy woman, to her who will accept marriage at any price and without any terms, is a policy inimical to the social enfranchisement of women. The children of the capable woman who even for a time has maintained her personal independence, will, other things being equal, be more likely to forward the cause of woman than the children of the dependent woman. Like many another movement, this one demands self-sacrifice from its adherents. It may suit its enemies to advise men to marry women who have had no practical knowledge of the struggle of life, and no share in it; it can never suit enlightened women to advocate such a policy.

It will probably be long before the average Englishman recognizes what the higher morality requires of him in assuring, so far as his conduct and effort can assure it, the position of his children. Indeed, up to the present one may almost say that he wilfully declines to see that there is any moral compulsion laid upon him to limit their numbers. The late Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant, when they frankly advocated this policy, were treated as disseminators of a shameful immorality, and sentenced by an English law court to fine and imprisonment. Dr. Pearson points out, in his remarkable work, *National Life and Character*, how impressed Holberg was in the eighteenth century with English readiness to examine new opinions, and to accept and teach them. Ours is another age; and though we have astonishing proof that the latter part of our century is casting off sluggish indifference to the wellbeing of the community, yet it would only be wise in progressive women to remember that in nothing do men yield more slowly than to the need of modifying their relations to women. If any proof be needed, the shameful divorce laws, which found their origin in a barbaric age, are still the law of the land; quite recently the House of Commons declined to remodel them in accordance with the growing spirit of justice, a reform demanded by a considerable number of its members.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the financial dependence of a married woman on her husband does not necessarily imply degradation. On the contrary, if women are capable administrators, if they can spend money wisely and save it reasonably, their value is as rubies. The writer is acquainted with women who married penniless, but who, knowing where

* See "The Endowment of the Daughter," in *Longman's Magazine*, April, 1888.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their talent lay, stipulated for the command of the purse. And it is just here where some experience of the value of money, its purchasing power, its painful inelasticity, is of the first importance. It is, on the whole, a much better thing for a woman to spend wisely her husband's income of say £400 than for her to give a divided mind to the administration of their home and continue work of her own by which that income is supplemented by, let us say, £130. It is true that men themselves do not always see this; at least not to the extent of giving a wife the command of the purse, or of settling a fair annual sum upon her as the price of entirely devoting her services to the wise management of the home. The sensible woman, she who is not just fresh from the schoolroom and entirely absorbed by the sweetness of love's young dream, will make this necessary arrangement for her comfort and reasonable independence in her husband's home before she crosses the threshold as his wife.

Wives who have failed to make such an arrangement, who have not foreseen that a husband's disposition displays far more human nature than a lover's, need not necessarily be "degraded" by financial dependence. Even in this case they may, and as a matter of fact often do, assume the direction of the household and obtain due respect and consideration. It is absurd to expect that character and capacity will not carry weight in the marriage relation as in every other. Nor is it going too far to say that, where a married woman has to ask her husband, after a few years of marriage, for every sovereign she has to spend on her clothes, she is deficient in these respects. Few men fighting the battle of life would choose of their own free will to both earn and spend their income; where they do so, it is usually a result of incapacity on the side of the wife, the proof of her failure to administer. Man is not so fond of double work as some would have us believe. The writer was intimately acquainted with a penniless lady who, at the age of exactly nineteen, married a man ten years older than herself. When they began life she received a weekly sum for household expenses, had to ask for every penny for her own clothing, and to ask it as a favor. But midway in a long married life she assumed the expenditure of her husband's income, because experience cannot justify the exclusion of a capable person from the direction of affairs, even when the age and inclination of the husband favor his assuming it.

The recognition of the fact that character and capacity are necessary in matrimony, that their absence is fatal to anything like a substantial equality of the sexes in every relation of life, will save us from much idle vaporing. Sex is a disqualification for much that is desirable in life; character and capacity never are. That many women possess them in an eminent degree explains the position they enjoy despite their sex; their absence explains far more in "the tyrant man" theory than perhaps progressive women are willing to allow. If the vanguard of the woman movement could contrive some system by which women of character and capacity should take precedence in their sex as candidates for matrimony, they might render a real service to "the cause," one of far more practical value than the mere statement that financial dependence is degrading.

C. S. BREMNER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED